DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 221 109 HE 015 441

TITLE	A Tale of Three Cities: Boston, Birmingham, Hartford.
INSTITUTION	Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-916584-18-6
PUB DATE	81
NOTE	79p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Ford Foundation, Box 559, Naugatuck, CT 06770 ($4.00).
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Advising; *Access to Education; Affirmative Action; Basic Skills; Career Counseling; *College Bound Students; Consortia; *Developmental Studies Programs; Economically Disadvantaged; Educationally Disadvantaged; Grants; Hispanic Americans; Information Services; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; Philanthropic Foundations; Private Colleges; Remedial Instruction; State Colleges; State Universities; *Student Recruitment; Two Year Colleges; Urban Population; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	Boston State College MA; Bunker Hill Community College MA; *Massachusetts (Boston); Massachusetts Bay Community College MA; Massachusetts College of Art; Miles College AL; Roxbury Community College MA; University of Hartford CT; University of Massachusetts Boston

ABSTRACT

A Ford Foundation program funded individual institutional programs focusing on higher education access and success for the inner-city poor, including remediation of basic skills, academic counseling and diagnosis of learning problems, and information services to help individuals make program choices. Three institutional programs are reported. In the first report, Ernest A. Lynton, with Diana Strange and Cornelia D'Mils, discusses the Boston Six (Boston State College, Bunker Hill Community College, Massachusetts Bay Community College, Massachusetts College of Art, Roxbury Community College, and the University of Massachusetts at Boston) as an example of cooperation among urban institutions and their three central administrations. Benefits to the institutions and the population, the potential impact of state higher education reorganization, limitations of institutional cooperation, and participants' comments are discussed. James R. Jordan discusses a program in which Miles College cooperated with the Birmingham, Alabama schools to use retired teachers to upgrade skills of students from first through eighth grades. Gail Spangenberg, with Morton Colemen and Jeffrey Daniels, discusses the University of Hartford's community outreach program for Hispanics. Project designs and goals, successes and problems, institutional cooperation, costs, and caveats are presented. Appendices include a list of Boston private postsecondary institutions, notes on the Boston Six institutions, and notes on related Ford Foundation grants. (MSE)

ED221109

A Tale of Three Cities
Boston, Birmingham, Hartford

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ford Foundation

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE015 441

FORD FOUNDATION
Series on Higher Education in the Cities

One of a series of reports on activities supported by the Ford Foundation. A complete list of Foundation publications may be obtained from the Ford Foundation's Office of Reports, 320 East 43 Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Main entry under title:

A Tale of Three Cities.

(Series on higher education in the cities; 2)

Contents: The Boston six/Ernest A. Lynton with Diana Strange and Cornelia D'Mils—Improving basic skills in Birmingham/James R. Jordan—Community outreach in Hartford/Gail Spangenberg with Morton Coleman and Jeffrey Daniels.

1. Education, Urban—United States—Case studies. 2. Education, Higher—United States—Case studies. 3. Poor—Education—United States—Case studies. I. Ford Foundation. II. Series.

LC5131.T34 370.19'348'0973 81-9790
ISBN 0-916584-18-6 AACR2

X-32 © Ford Foundation 1981

Contents

5 FOREWORD

9 **The Boston Six**
Institutional Cooperation among Urban Colleges and Universities

by Ernest A. Lynton, with Diana Strange and Cornelia D'Mils

31 **Improving Basic Skills In Birmingham**
A Joint Effort by Retired Teachers, Miles College, and the Public Schools

by James R. Jordan

53 **Community Outreach in Hartford**
A Higher Education Program for Hispanics

by Gail Spangenberg, with Morton Coleman and Jeffrey Daniels

73 APPENDIX A: Private Postsecondary Institutions in Boston

74 APPENDIX B: Descriptions of The Boston Six Institutions

76 APPENDIX C: Ford Foundation Grants

Foreword

In the coming years there will be no more important challenge to higher education institutions than to preserve and extend their commitment to the poor and disadvantaged. That is particularly true of the cities, where so many people in need of help are concentrated—racial and ethnic minorities, unemployed youth, recent immigrants, and others. Their education—in the schools and beyond—is critical to their future and to that of the cities as well. In considerable part, the solution to many of the problems of cities depends on educating the people who live and work in them.

At the higher education level, this job falls primarily to urban-oriented colleges and universities—institutions in the central cities whose educational mission, whether by charter or default, is to serve the cities' people. Their undergraduate enrollments reflect that orientation, and because these institutions are based in the city and serve such a diverse range of people and needs, they have special problems that need to be much more widely recognized and addressed. There remains an alarming gap between those served and those locked out of higher education in the cities. The future well-being of the cities, their higher education institutions, and their people depend in large part on narrowing the gap (and remaining firm in the resolve to do so) despite financial constraints and other obstacles.

In 1978, and again in mid-1980, the Foundation's concern about these issues prompted it to make a series of grants totalling some $1.1 million to help urban-oriented colleges and universities—and those who make and shape policy affecting them—to examine and work on undergraduate services and programs for the inner-city poor and disadvantaged. The focus of the overall program was on those problem areas affecting most

directly educational access and success for these people. From the standpoint of what current and potential students need, the main problems seemed to be: (1) remediation of basic skills, including training in English as a second language; (2) academic counseling, guidance, and diagnosis of learning problems; and (3) information services that help students to learn about the array of educational institutions and programs available in their cities, to choose wisely from among them, and then to wend their way through the maze of procedures, requirements, and forms that bear on getting admitted to college and obtaining financial aid.

In order to help colleges and universities provide a fuller range of such services and programs, the Foundation designed its grants to emphasize interinstitutional planning and the sharing of resources. Given the economic facts of life today, institutions of higher education are challenged to do more educationally with fewer resources. It is no secret that most institutions have a natural inclination to resolve their difficulties in their own separate ways. But in order to deal effectively with higher education problems in the cities, there needs to be a much greater willingness—by colleges, universities, schools, communities, and city government agencies—to join together around common problems, develop solutions cooperatively, and share resources.

Six of the eight grants the Foundation made in 1978 were the result of a competition in which some fifty-five urban-oriented colleges and universities in thirteen major cities participated.* A seventh grant established a national communications network of urban-oriented colleges and universities. Under an eighth grant, which is one of others being planned on aspects of government policy affecting the participation of low-income and other needy people in higher education, the Washington Office of the College Board conducted a study of the obstacles to the full use of federal student aid and loan programs by the urban poor.

To share the results of all the grants, the Foundation is publishing a series of booklets collectively called *Higher Education in the Cities*. The College Board study appeared in February, 1981 under the title *Student Aid and the Urban Poor*. An overview paper tentatively entitled *Backs Against the Wall: Urban-Oriented Colleges and Universities and the Urban Poor and Disadvantaged*, is scheduled for publication later in 1981.

This second report in the series describes three of the institutional projects funded in the first phase of the program. Ernest A. Lynton, until recently Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs at the University of Massachusetts, discusses The Boston Six as an example of institutional

*Five of the six projects recently received supplemental support; the sixth still operates under the original grant. For a listing and brief description of the grants made to or on behalf of urban-oriented colleges and universities, see Appendix C.

cooperation among urban colleges and universities. James R. Jordan, of the American Council on Education, discusses a program in which Miles College cooperated with the schools in Birmingham to use retired teachers to upgrade the basic skills of students from the first through eighth grades. And Gail Spangenberg, an independent education consultant, discusses the University of Hartford's community outreach program for Hispanics. The three reports were written in the fall of 1980.

The projects described herein have worked well. They are simple in their design and yet imaginative. The purpose in presenting papers about them is not to hold them up as the best or as the only efforts of their kind, or to suggest that they have worked perfectly in every respect. But, as judged by persons who know them, these programs are promising models, which ought to be shared with others around the country who are engaged in a search for ways to improve their instructional services for poor and disadvantaged students. By improving education services, particularly in the inner city, countless Americans who need further education to help them overcome multiple barriers of deprivation can begin to gain control of their own lives.

As new opportunities arise, other topics may be added to this series on Higher Education in the Cities. Some of the efforts now being made to identify and to analyze policy issues could lead to one or more publications by the Foundation or by others. Two of the Foundation-assisted institutional projects—those at Jersey City State College and at the University of the District of Columbia—are expected to reach soon a stage at which accounts of their work may be useful. A final report on the assessment project undertaken by the San Francisco Consortium of Colleges, because it is primarily of local interest, was printed and distributed by the consortium in the summer of 1980.

In the meantime, we hope these three case studies will help practitioners and policy makers in shaping the future of American cities and the role of higher education in city life.

Ford Foundation
March 1981

EDWARD J. MEADE, JR.

7

The Boston Six

Institutional Cooperation Among Urban Colleges and Universities

by Ernest A. Lynton,
with Diana Strange and Cornelia D'Mils

Ours is an age in which even sophisticated and well-educated persons find it increasingly difficult to understand and to cope with the institutions and the procedures with which they have to deal on a daily basis. No longer are answers to problems simple, if indeed, they exist at all. Rules and regulations proliferate, but instead of resulting in the relative comfort of regimentation, they lead to a sense of being caught up in a maze of confusing, often contradictory, directions. Increasingly this sense of dismay and helplessness arises from the restrictive agencies of our society—law, taxation, federal and state regulatory bodies, and the like—but also from those that are supposed to provide services and support. The individual is bewildered by proliferation and competition, conflicting and strident claims for attention and patronage, Kafkaesque wanderings from one office to another, the sense of obtaining partial glimpses but never an entire view.

This growing complexity of society, difficult for everyone, presents almost insurmountable obstacles to the underprivileged and to the undereducated. Their economic and social insecurity is accentuated by their inability to gain the attention and benefits of the very institutions

designed to help them. Unfortunately, educational institutions, particularly postsecondary ones, seem especially confusing in their claims and requirements. The public is confronted with a bewildering variety of institutions that offer a broad range of degrees, certificates, and diplomas—many of which sound very similar to the uninitiated. To the array of public and private colleges is increasingly added a plethora of proprietary institutions, advertising glittering guarantees of success.

There are many reasons why cooperation among urban colleges and universities is important and beneficial. Not the least is the need to work together so they may provide a better understanding of the range of choices available to potential students among the traditionally underserved urban population. In a small but important way, a coordinated offering of information lessens the sense of confusion and powerlessness that is such a barrier to those who are on the fringes of our society.

There exists, of course, another and much simpler way to bring this about: remove the element of choice and automatically relegate this segment of urban residents to one category of institutions. The institutions and individuals involved in The Boston Six categorically reject this alternative. They firmly believe that all potential students, regardless of background, should have access to all levels of higher education for which they are individually motivated and possess the capacity. But many such students need coordinated information and guidance in order to be able to make the optimal choice. Urban universities, four-year colleges, and community colleges all share an obligation to meet the needs of the underserved.

It was the awareness by college and university administrators in Boston—as much as any other motivation—that something must be done for this population that led to the formation of The Boston Six.

The Context

HIGHER EDUCATION IN MASSACHUSETTS

In their number, their variety, and their organization, the colleges and universities in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts are probably less well understood than the higher education institutions of any other state. There, the sector of public higher education consists of fifteen community colleges; eleven state colleges, including a College of Art and a Maritime Academy; the University of Lowell; Southeastern Massachusetts University (SMU); and the three campuses of the University of Massachusetts. These institutions have been governed by five separate

Boards of Trustees: one each for the community colleges, the state colleges, Lowell, SMU, and the University of Massachusetts. In addition, there was a statewide Board of Higher Education, which had no direct authority over any of the institutions, and also a cabinet-level Secretary of Educational Affairs.

In the spring of 1980, the Massachusetts legislature inserted into the Appropriations Act for the fiscal year of 1981 language that brought a radical restructuring of public higher education in the state. The Act abolished the statewide boards for the state and community colleges, the Board of Higher Education, and the position of the Secretary of Educational Affairs. To replace them, the Act created a Board of Regents with authority over all public colleges and universities, and it established separate Boards of Trustees for each of the state and community colleges.

All together these public institutions have a total student enrollment of only 98,000. This total in the public sector is far less than the enrollment in the state's private colleges and universities, of which there exist no fewer than eighty in Massachusetts. For example, enrollments in private postsecondary institutions in Boston alone totaled 87,000 students in 1978.

The private institutions are also, by and large, older than the public ones and, on the whole, better known among the local population. The growth of the public sector has been quite recent, later even than in such other northeastern states as New York and New Jersey. As recently as 1947, what is now the University of Massachusetts was the Massachusetts State College with a sole campus at Amherst and an enrollment of 2,400. There were then eight teachers' colleges enrolling 2,370 students, an art college (487), a maritime academy (150), and no community colleges.

This late and limited development of public higher education has a number of consequences directly germane to the issue of urban higher education. Most important among them is a prevalent lack of self-image, and even of self-confidence, within public institutions. There is a concomitant tendency to emulate the more prestigious private colleges instead of seeking to define and to fulfill a distinct public role. At the same time, and reinforcing the institutions' lack of self-awareness, the public at large has only limited knowledge of the public colleges and does not turn instinctively to them for education and service.

The public's ignorance about the public resources for higher education in the Commonwealth is strikingly true in the Boston area, where white ethnic groups, which are predominantly Catholic, look much more to Jesuit-run Boston College, which is located in Chestnut Hill, than to nearby public institutions. For their own children, Boston Brahmins choose Harvard; for the children of their employees, they founded Northeastern University in 1898.

THE BOSTON METROPOLITAN AREA

Because Boston's central city differs significantly from other areas in the state, it is important to be aware of the characteristics of the Boston environment to understand the potential of The Boston Six. The Boston economy is highly service oriented; people have a strong neighborhood identity; public secondary schools, except for the so-called exam schools, have a poor reputation; and public higher education takes a back seat in a metropolitan area where Harvard, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), and Boston University are in the limelight.

The Economy. Like many urban areas, Boston has experienced an outmigration of residents and businesses since 1950. After reaching a peak of 800,000 in 1950, the population of the city of Boston has declined over the past thirty years to an estimated 596,000. The city has a high concentration of government agencies (state and federal), higher education institutions (twenty-six located in Boston proper), hospitals, and other service-related activities.

According to a 1975 report prepared by the First National Bank of Boston for the Boston School Committee, by 1985 hard industry will account for only 20 per cent of the total employment in Boston. The remaining employment opportunities will be in the service and high technology industries.

Daniel Rose, a New York developer, recently told a group of Boston businessmen that one million square feet of office space could be expected to be constructed in Boston annually for the next three or four years. This space will be occupied by 15,000 to 20,000 new office workers. Fifty per cent of the minicomputers in the world are designed and assembled in this region. The tourism and convention industry is growing rapidly with plans for construction of more and more hotel space, and jobs will be available in this industry as well.

In this boom community, jobs go begging; people are underprepared. In Boston an estimated 47 per cent of the adult population has not completed high school. Within the black community this figure approaches 56 per cent and rises to 90 per cent among Boston's Hispanic population. A statewide Graduate Equivalency Diploma (GED) program provides the opportunity to earn a high school equivalency diploma for the nearly 1.4 million individuals in Massachusetts (one-third of the population of the state over eighteen) who have never finished high school. In the past year, in greater Boston, about 2,400 people were awarded their GED diplomas from programs in community schools, at Boston State College, and elsewhere.

Political leaders in Massachusetts, from the mayor of Boston to the

governor and his staff, have recognized the need and responsibility to train some of these undertrained people for the available jobs. In his recent inaugural address, Mayor Kevin White predicted an economic boom for Boston in the 1980s. He called for better communication between the "system which trains and the system which employs" so that Boston residents will profit from the improving economic conditions by access to these jobs. Governor Edward King in his 1980 "State of the State" address sounded a similar theme by creating the Bay State Project, an effort to educate and train Massachusetts people for technical and business jobs in the state. George Kariotis, state secretary of economic affairs, observed that high-technology and other companies will have to expand in the cities "not only because the untapped labor pool is in the cities, but because of the energy crisis." Urban dwellers most likely to be recruited and trained for growth industries in Massachusetts, Kariotis said are dropouts, young blacks, women, and retirees.

The Neighborhoods. Twenty-five years ago, in a study of Boston as it entered the era of urban renewal, the sociologist Herbert Gans characterized the city as a collection of urban villages with highly distinctive ethnic and cultural differences. Boston's nineteen neighborhoods still reflect those differences. Many residents are first-generation immigrants who do not speak English. A recent school department study has revealed that over fifteen different languages are represented among the children attending the public schools. Frequently, people in these communities are undereducated for the available jobs and do not see themselves or their children moving into them. Higher education is something unfamiliar and usually not even considered. For Boston's large Irish-American population, security and upward mobility have traditionally been achieved by joining the municipal work forces of police, fire fighters, or streetcar drivers—jobs for which higher education is not required.

Because Boston and communities nearby are among the oldest in America, each has its own historical identity. The central city of Boston has remained small. Unlike other large metropolitan centers, Boston has not grown by annexing new suburban communities. Even within the boundaries of the city, residents maintain a powerful neighborhood identity. In this age of high mobility, many Boston residents are born, live and die in the same communities. Some only rarely travel to downtown Boston.

In the past ten years, young affluent families have been moving from the suburbs into these neighborhoods. Reasonably priced multiple-family dwellings, accessibility to work and culture, rising costs of gasoline and fuel oil have all helped to precipitate a "back-to-the-city move-

ment." This return to the city, however, has increased tension between new and old residents. Residents who have lived in the city all their lives feel they are being squeezed out by the newcomers.

The Secondary Schools. The secondary schools in the Boston area reflect the economic and ethnic diversity that make Boston and the communities surrounding it a collection of enclaves regulated by class traditions and by often narrowly defined educational and occupational expectations. Educational opportunity and economic status increase in a widening ripple from the core city and its depressed contiguous cities, such as Chelsea and Somerville, to the affluent suburbs bordering the high-technology belt of Route 128, which encircles the metropolitan area.

The public high schools in the city of Boston can be grouped into three clusters.

- Entrance-by-exam schools
- Magnet schools* created by the court-ordered desegregation
- Neighborhood schools

The three exam schools are Boston Latin, Latin Academy, and Boston Technical High School. The most prestigious of the three is Boston Latin, which was founded in 1635 and has for years had a national reputation for excellence. Graduation from Boston Latin virtually insures admission to higher education. In 1978, 229 of its 242 graduates went to college, better than 94 per cent.

As a result of the court-ordered desegregation, district high schools were changed to comply with the order and to provide special vocational-occupational programs open to students from all parts of the city. Five magnet schools were established to provide special academic emphasis in order to encourage capable students who did not go to the exam schools to go on to college. Still, only half of these students continue their education after high school graduation.

The final cluster of high schools in the city of Boston are the district or neighborhood schools, located in the different ethnic neighborhoods of the city. Attendance at these high schools has implied the termination of the student's formal education, usually without adequate preparation even for the world of work. The implication of the court order has somewhat diffused the ethnic populations concentrated in these neighborhood schools, but the goals and aspirations of students in these

*So called because they are intended to attract both minority and white students out of their neighborhoods by offering an attractive combination of courses generally not available elsewhere.

district schools still reflect those of the surrounding neighborhood in each case.

A survey of the data on 1979 graduates of the nineteen Boston public high schools in 1979 shows:

- Of students graduating from exam schools, 80 per cent go on to college.
- Of students graduating from magnet schools, 52 per cent go on to college or other postsecondary institutions.
- Of students graduating from neighborhood schools, 41 per cent go on to college or other postsecondary institutions. Of the $4.8 million in financial aid for further study awarded to all Boston high school graduates, $3.5 million, or 73 per cent, went to Boston Latin and to Latin Academy students, who together constituted less than 11 per cent of the total graduating from all schools.
- Of all students, about 14 per cent go neither to college, nor to work, nor to the military services.

The court-ordered desegregation mandate has drastically affected the enrollments of the Boston public school system. In the past ten years public school enrollment has fallen 20 per cent. This statistic, coupled with a declining birthrate, implies a projection of a further decline by 1987 (from 93,756 in 1963 to 52,362 by 1987).

In addition to this decline, it is estimated that the school dropout rate is close to 12 per cent. Approximately 32,000 young people in Boston between the ages of 16 and 21 are not in school. Over 30 per cent of them do not have a high school diploma. Of the city's black youth in this age bracket who are not in school, 50 per cent do not have a high school diploma. For Spanish-speaking youth in the same category, 70 per cent do not have a high school diploma.

Unemployment among Boston's out-of-school youth who are between 16 years and 21 years of age is about 36 per cent, close to the national average for this age group. However, for those who have not completed high school, the rate of unemployment is much higher. For the 10,000 young people in Boston who do not have a high school diploma, unemployment is estimated at 53 per cent; for black and Hispanic youth, 64 per cent.

Institutions of Higher Education. Much of what characterizes higher education in Massachusetts is apparent in Boston. The public sector in the city is small, with a total state-supported enrollment of only about 16,500, and an additional 10,600 in self-supporting continuing education programs. These relatively few students are enrolled in six different institutions, each of which is governed by a different board of trustees:

Bunker Hill Community College (founded in 1973);
Massachusetts Bay Community College (1961);
Roxbury Community College (1973);
Boston State College (1851);
Massachusetts College of Art (1873);
University of Massachusetts at Boston (1965).

By contrast, nearly 90,000 students are enrolled in private institutions, which range in size from Northeastern University (34,000) and Boston University (24,000) to Laboure Junior College and New England College of Optometry, which have 450 and 350, respectively. (Appendix A contains a complete list of private postsecondary institutions in Boston.)

On the whole, until the creation of The Boston Six, the six public institutions had little contact and even less cooperation with each other. One limited exception was in the area of transfers between the two-year and four-year institutions. In 1974, the governing boards of public higher education endorsed the so-called Transfer Company, which called for increasing cooperation and which guaranteed admitted transfer students in liberal arts curricula full faith and credit for their community college courses.

Each of the six public institutions has been in some measure trying to broaden access to its courses and programs by the underserved urban population. Roxbury Community College was specifically created to serve the needs of the largely minority population of Roxbury and has made heroic efforts with minimal resources. Over the years Bunker Hill has developed a number of imaginative and innovative outreach efforts, such as the Educational Outreach Program, a special entry process serving about 100 welfare mothers every year. Both Boston State College and the University of Massachusetts at Boston sponsor transitional programs for high school students, either in conjunction with or in lieu of their senior year. The College of Public and Community Service of the university has a largely adult student body with an average age of about thirty-three, almost all of whom are in or intend to move into public and community service occupations. The college uses a competency-based approach and has elaborate techniques to assess the prior experience with which most of its students enter. A new gerontology program, designed to train people to provide social services for the elderly, enrolled, during its pilot phase, twenty-five students, most of whom are senior citizens.

But even with these and other attempts at outreach and at improving access, and even though none of the institutions provides residential

facilities, only 35 per cent to 40 per cent of the total enrollment comes from the city of Boston itself, and only about two-thirds from Greater Boston, defined as essentially all communities within the belt highway Route 128.

It is within this context that The Boston Six public institutions responded to the invitation of the Ford Foundation to submit a proposal for an urban education grant.

Activities of The Boston Six

Early in 1978, the Ford Foundation approached a number of institutions falling into its category of urban-oriented colleges and universities—institutions that are fundamentally community and service oriented and that serve large, diverse student bodies primarily from the metropolitan area. The Foundation elicited from these institutions ideas about how their urban educational mission could be enhanced. On the basis of preliminary discussions that stressed the importance of interinstitutional cooperation as outlined earlier in this paper, the Foundation invited the six public institutions of higher education in Boston to submit a joint proposal to address "the educational problems...of disadvantaged...groups with special educational needs."

As noted, the institutions that constituted themselves as The Boston Six are Boston State College, Bunker Hill Community College, Massachusetts Bay Community College, Massachusetts College of Art, Roxbury Community College, and the University of Massachusetts at Boston. (For a description of each, see Appendix B.) The central administrations to which these institutions related in 1978 were the University Administration of the University of Massachusetts, the Chancellor's Office of the State College, and the President's Office of the Community Colleges. As a result of the 1980 reorganization, each state and community college now has its own board, and there is no central administration.

From its inception, The Boston Six was seen as a joint effort not only of the six institutions but also of the three central administrations. The heads of the institutions and of the central administrations each named a representative to the steering committee charged with planning and implementing the work of The Boston Six. During the six weeks after the Foundation's initial invitation, this steering committee met frequently for intensive planning sessions and developed a joint proposal that was submitted in June 1978.

From the start, the steering committee of The Boston Six worked well together; its members quickly recognized the need to join forces in order to address the educational needs of the target population. The group decided that its first and principal emphasis would be on *access*. The institutions would try to identify those youths in the city who are educationally underserved; to assess their work and school experiences and their education needs; to develop programs to meet those needs; and to reach out with information, advice, and encouragement. The goal would be to use a cooperative, interinstitutional approach as a way to promote economies of scale and avoid wasteful duplication as well as to provide prospective students with comparative information about the institutions and with noncompetitive counseling and assessment.

For those youths whose educational needs had gone unmet, the members of The Boston Six steering committee recognized that improved access and recruiting would not be enough. They determined there must be procedures and programs that would focus on the *retention of students* as well as their *mobility*. The Boston Six wanted to explore ways of improving efforts in remedial instruction and supportive counseling. Recognizing that some students find, after entering one institution, that their aspirations change, The Boston Six decided it would be very important to focus also on everything that would facilitate student mobility among institutions. Finally, it was evident that in the long run the cooperating institutions could hope to meet a substantial part of the urban population's educational needs only through coordinated long-range planning that was aimed at complementary academic programming, at sharing facilities and faculty, and at developing new ventures jointly.

The intensive collaboration by the six institutions in developing a joint proposal for the Ford Foundation had a striking and gratifying outcome, one that was perhaps anticipated by the Foundation: The Boston Six decided to continue to work together regardless of the Foundation's response to the proposal. The sense of reciprocal discovery and the burgeoning of a cooperative spirit was extraordinary. Although neither then nor at any time since have any of the six institutions lessened their sense of distinct identity, a permanent and working basis was established for interinstitutional cooperation.

As part of its new sense of community, the group decided to address itself to cooperative efforts that could be initiated immediately, before the Foundation responded to its proposal. Early in the fall of 1978, staff members from each institution's offices of admissions and student financial aid met; for the first time, some of them had an opportunity to share their mutual concerns. Together, they identified several goals for joint action:

- *To develop a joint referral system.* This would require each of them to learn more about the programs at the other institutions.
- *To publish information jointly about the range of program options.* This would help institutional representatives to become better informed about options available to students and would be a resource for potential students who needed more information about choices open to them.
- *To arrange a "joint articulation day" with guidance personnel in Boston's public schools.* This would allow all six institutions to begin soliciting students systematically and thoroughly throughout the city.

The steering committee continued to meet. Three working subgroups were established according to the interests of the participants. (1) A High School Task Force, with its chairman from Boston State, was organized to identify the characteristics of this large group of underserved youth. (2) The Adult Learners Task Force, chaired by the representative from Bunker Hill Community College, was constituted to examine the needs of the growing number of adults for whom higher education had become a choice. (3) The Program Planning Task Force (later called "Action"), headed by the representative of the University of Massachusetts at Boston, assumed responsibility for projects already outlined by the steering committee, including projects with admissions and financial aid officers on each campus. The affiliation of the chairmen of the groups is mentioned to indicate how from the first the organization of The Boston Six attempted to stress the partnership and sharing of responsibility among the participating institutions.

In October 1978, the Ford Foundation sent a letter announcing the grant. By then, the operating structure of The Boston Six was established, and steps were being taken to hire an executive secretary, who would be the primary staff person of the steering committee. The three task forces would generate ideas and develop plans for their implementation that would be approved by the steering committee and—if necessary—the institutional executive officers before being put in place by the executive secretary's staff in cooperation with institutional representatives.

The Boston Six had determined to orient their efforts toward practical actions rather than research projects. This decision was confirmed by the presidents and chancellors when they again met together in February 1979 to review an outline of the plans of The Boston Six and to confirm the need to appoint a Program Planning Task Force, which would be made up of senior academic personnel. The purpose of this group was to address the programmatic implications of any proposed actions and to initiate program-related proposals.

The plans presented to the steering committee and to the high school principals emphasized efforts to make information about educational choices available in Boston to people who do not learn about these kinds of options through the usual high school channels. The Adult Learners Task Force developed a slide-tape called *Now Is My Time* featuring four Boston Six adult students. This visual aid has been presented in Boston at community schools, to workshops set up under the Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA), and to the Cambridge Foster Grandparents Organization, to mention just a few examples. A member from The Boston Six conducts the program as one method of reaching out to adults who need information about attending college.

The Action Task Force developed a slide-tape presentation that has been given at all nineteen of Boston's public high schools. It features six young people who are at present students and has been shown by institutional representatives in collaboration with staff members of The Boston Six to groups of youth in nontraditional programs in the high schools of Boston and of nearby communities. As a result of this first round of presentations, nearly 800 high school students have requested additional information about institutions in The Boston Six.

Since the aim of this presentation is to encourage students to consider college as an option, The Boston Six plans to show the slide-tape in the spring of 1981 to juniors and to follow up in the fall by addressing more specific needs to help students refine their decisions about their futures.

A third outreach activity has been the development of in-service workshops conducted by Boston Six staff to provide information about public higher education in the Boston area. Called *Access to College: A Workshop Series for Human Service Professionals*, the program was conceived to familiarize counselors and administrators with specific programs and services available at institutions of The Boston Six. The Boston Six plans to sponsor workshops with various groups in the spring, including counselors from Cambridge Rindge School and Boston Latin School, Metro Coordinators,* and counselors at Boston's Employment Economic Policy Administration (EEPA). Institutional admissions and financial aid staff members in cooperation with the College Entrance Examination Board have assisted The Boston Six in these workshops.

Other efforts were undertaken to provide information about financial aid available to each of The Boston Six. They included workshops in several Boston high schools and a drop-in center, located in downtown Boston, which was opened for a week during February 1980 to dispense information about student aid. Promoted in the local press and broadcast

*Metco is a voluntary program under which urban youths attend suburban schools.

media, the center helped about 200 persons complete federal forms for financial aid. To assist institutional representatives and staff members of The Boston Six in this task, personnel from the Educational Opportunity Center of Boston contributed their time and energy during the week.

These activities reflect the early commitment of The Boston Six to spread among the underserved Boston populations information about the educational choices available to them. It is also apparent that these outreach activities have gained the cooperation of community agencies, Boston public schools, the College Board, the Boston EEPA, and CETA. All have worked together with The Boston Six to reach out to Boston populations traditionally not served by higher education.

All of these activities have been designed to get Boston Six information out of the institutions to the underserved in the greater Boston community. Another early cooperative effort has been directed toward faculty and staff development. The Boston Six promoted and coordinated participation of forty of their faculty and staff in the northeastern regional meeting of the Council for the Advancement of Experiential Learning (CAEL), which focused on the educational needs of the increasing numbers of students over twenty-five years of age. Participants had the opportunity to consider ways of assessing and crediting nonacademic prior learning.

Later in the fall of 1979, Dr. Lee Noel from American College Testing (ACT) conducted a two-day workshop in Boston on retention issues, and it, too, was attended by representatives of The Boston Six. After the regional workshop, The Boston Six invited participants to a seminar at Boston State College given by Dr. Noel. In that session, he gave special attention to particular problems faced by urban institutions, including the unmet needs of adult students.

The Boston Six cosponsored with CAEL a daylong faculty development workshop led by Professor Malcolm Knowles, author of *The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species* and other books about teaching adults. Fifty of the region's educators, who were from all six New England states and New York, discussed competency-based learning and techniques for helping students work with faculty to develop individual learning programs. More than half the participants were from The Boston Six.

While focusing on activities designed to serve students, The Boston Six has also been gathering information as background for various kinds of possible social action. The High School Task Force has undertaken an intensive survey of youths from eighteen to twenty-one years old in three target communities to determine incentives and disincentives to participation in postsecondary education. The results of this survey will identify the kinds of action that The Boston Six can take to encourage these young people to consider higher education.

The Adult Learners Task Force has interviewed key individuals in each institution to learn about the practice of experiential education in The Boston Six. This survey has uncovered areas of common activity and shared needs that the task force hopes to convert into specific recommendations for action in the context of cooperative education and internship programs, individual learning programs, and assessments of prior learning. This study will also be useful as The Boston Six begins to work on issues surrounding the transfer of credit.

The Program Planning Task Force has begun its work by collecting material on a wide range of institutional practices. These include application procedures for being admitted; techniques for retaining students; services for English as a second language (ESL); career and job counseling; and instruction in basic skills. Based on the information they have gathered, members of this task force have begun to promote areas of cooperation among The Boston Six.

The first of these is cross-registration among institutions. A draft proposal for cross-registration policies and procedures has been submitted for discussion by the steering committee and on the campuses. Attention is also being given to the development of a common application form as another way of enhancing student choice.

In its first eighteen months, The Boston Six has firmly established a pattern of interinstitutional cooperation primarily in types of activities that each institution had earlier carried out individually. As will be described in the next section of this paper, this first level of cooperation is of considerable benefit in a variety of ways.

Since January 1980, The Boston Six has moved toward a second level of cooperation: the development of joint activities that go beyond what any one institution is currently doing. As the first level enhances the individual activities of an institution through cooperation, the second level will allow The Boston Six to create innovative joint projects.

The initial activities of The Boston Six have indicated clearly two major areas of need. This first is to provide for the nontraditional student an expanded, comprehensive, and interrelated set of preentry services:

1. career counseling, guidance, and planning
2. identification of educational needs, based where necessary on assessment of prior learning experiences
3. information about the availability of pertinent educational opportunities
4. assistance with admission and financial aid procedures
5. programs to develop basic skills

These services must be available to all individuals likely to profit from a postsecondary education. Young people who attend the Boston public

high schools receive minimal guidance and advice concerning college opportunities. A first step in remedying this condition is for colleges and universities to collaborate closely among themselves and with the area's high schools. Already several components under items (3) and (4) of the services listed above are being developed by The Boston Six.

Young people who are no longer in high school—whether they be graduates or dropouts—to say nothing of adults—all need new channels of communication if they are to benefit from preentry services. It is the development of these new channels of communication that is the other and second major need confronting The Boston Six.

In efforts to improve educational access for persons from traditionally underserved urban populations, it is essential, for psychological as well as economic reasons, to avoid presenting them with a choice between taking a job or going to college. Approaches must be developed to combine the two, in ways that relate the education to the work, and that thereby make possible a steady improvement of work-related skills and understanding. Although this is not a guarantee of upward mobility, it is a necessary condition to allow both young people and adults in entry-level jobs to move into more responsible positions. This is particularly true in those sectors—service-oriented enterprises and high-technology industries—in which the Boston area has an excess of jobs and a shortage of skilled employees.

Within this context a number of projects are currently at the design and funding stages. They include pilot programs in the Boston public schools to broaden awareness of career possibilities; community-based programs for adults to explore new careers; and programs for promoting access by urban youth to technical careers.

The Boston Six: A Case Study of Interinstitutional Cooperation

BENEFITS TO THE INSTITUTIONS

A number of basic advantages are likely to stem from any cooperative venture—no matter where it is located, what its purpose, or whether its components are similar or dissimilar. In the first place, there is the likelihood of efficiency of scale. Up to a certain point, the cost effectiveness of many activities increases with the size of operation, and this obviously is true for a number of the projects that have been or will

be undertaken by The Boston Six. Above all, the participating institutions can jointly support a small professional staff that can assist the interinstitutional task forces, carry forward the ideas and proposals emerging from these groups, and give to the collective enterprise that catalytic element needed to make the whole greater than the sum of its parts.

A second advantage of a consortium such as The Boston Six is that it is likely to give to the various collaborative projects an increased degree of visibility and even legitimacy, which they might not have if sponsored or undertaken by any single institution. The Boston Six has already found this to be true in its dealings with the public at large, with the media, with legislators and executive agencies, and with potential funding sources. A significant underlying cause of The Boston Six's favorable public reception is undoubtedly the general predisposition of society to approve every effort at cooperation among its social service institutions.

A third advantage derives from the opportunity to exchange information, experience, and expertise among the participants. Early task force sessions were in a way miniprofessional meetings of individuals who shared similar interests, and there was no one who did not come away with more knowledge and understanding. That kind of immediate gratification was in itself a substantial incentive for cooperation: it compensated busy individuals and understaffed institutions for some of the time and effort spent on Boston Six activities.

The opportunities for exchange are of special importance to urban colleges and universities. They have an urgent need to understand the nature and the needs of their potential clientele, particularly when the needs are nontraditional. Therefore, it is necessary for them to develop many nontraditional channels of communication among themselves and with the underserved population. For the latter they use as a base the network of service agencies, community groups, and individuals, to which each urban institution has some ties.

In addition, personal contact among the institutional staffs has helped to break the inevitable sense of isolation and to diminish the debilitating frustration that tends to beset individuals working against heavy odds. In a time of decreasing support in federal and state budgets, it is an uphill struggle to reach out to the underserved urban population and to provide it with educational opportunities. When shared, this task becomes easier.

A fourth advantage of a cooperative approach to new ventures is risk minimization. To change patterns of recruitment is a high-risk affair, especially for institutions in which one person constitutes the admissions office.

Looking back on the first eighteen months of cooperation, one can characterize the efforts of The Boston Six as starting on the periphery of

the six institutions—informational outreach to underserved populations—and then slowly working toward areas more central to the six institutions, such as credit issues under cross-registration or cooperation in offering courses in English as a second language. Perhaps one of the more obvious lessons for other urban colleges and universities that are considering joint action is the usefulness of focusing on "low-risk" starting points during the initial phases of building trust among members of a consortium.

These low-risk starting points can be summarized in a dual imperative: supplement and substitute. Supplemental activities in a consortium are those that none of the individual members does or would do on its own. Substitutions are those that replace activities ordinarily done separately by individual member institutions. The line of division between these two kinds of activities need not remain hard and fast. For example, expanding recruitment activities to include adults in high school equivalency programs may, at first, be supplemental. But, as recruitment of adults becomes more central to each institution in the consortium, this source of recruitment may become a substitute for more traditional ones.

Obviously, it is easier with supplements such as computer-assisted career planning services or a jointly sponsored public service TV announcement. Substitutions, such as joint recruitment or a common program in English as a second language, require a much higher degree of trust, coordination, integration.

The most negative factor about the experience of The Boston Six, and perhaps any similar experience, is the inherent imbalance that results when institutions of different size come together. From the early stages it was obvious that a large university can commit more personnel and resources to a project of this kind than smaller institutions can. The inevitable perception is that the largest participant will reap greater benefits from the consortium because it has greater resources. One also has to recognize the concern of small institutions that the end result of cooperation for them may be a reduction of their respective student enrollments.

BENEFITS TO THE POPULATION

Much more important than the advantages of interinstitutional cooperation for the institutions themselves are the potential gains for the target population. These can be grouped into three categories: clarification, choice, and mobility.

As already indicated, a strong motivating factor in developing The Boston Six was the sense that everyone, and most particularly those with

the least prior exposure to higher education, must be confused and perhaps even discouraged by the variety of programs and institutions. For a middle-class high school student on a college preparatory track there exist, at least, the services of guidance counselors and thus some opportunity to sort out the differences—and similarities—among the options. Such opportunities do not exist for the high school dropout, the youth on a vocational track, or for the working-class adult in a noncollege-going family.

A principal advantage, then, of a consortium of heterogeneous institutions is the opportunity to provide some clarification of the characteristics of the participating institutions and to explain their similarities and differences so they can be related to different aspirations.

This leads directly to enhancing educational choice for the urban population. Choice can be made only on the basis of information, without which the process of choosing a postsecondary school becomes one of random (and usually erroneous) selection. Thus a major purpose of The Boston Six is to help potential students among the underserved urban groups to make an informed choice rather than a random selection—and clearly this is made much easier by the cooperation of a group of heterogeneous institutions providing a range of options.

But even the most informed choice can rest only on the circumstances of the moment. The likelihood that these will change with time is again particularly great, given the target population of The Boston Six. In the first place, and most important, aspirations may grow as confidence increases with early success. Furthermore, the marginal population, more than others, is susceptible to economic fluctuations and changes in job opportunities. These and related factors place a premium on providing optimal mobility for the students. They can be greatly helped by the possibility of starting in one institution and being able to move to another, or using some initial services in one college and then going to another. For example, students can enroll in remedial programs, like English as a second language, which serve all members of the consortium, and at completion still be free to choose from the entire range of educational opportunities offered by the consortium. This kind of cooperation leads to efficiencies without restricting student mobility.

A consortium of institutions also provides advantages in pursuing the two major areas of need described above. The provision of comprehensive preentry counseling and information to adults and youths not in high school requires the building of a network of channels for communication with community groups and a variety of public and private organizations. Obviously, this network can be constructed most effectively by a group of educational institutions rather than by each operating independently.

The same advantage in achieving an extensive and efficient network applies to projects that tie together work and education. Such projects must of necessity involve a multiplicity of potential employers, youth agencies, and other participants. Again, a consortium of local colleges and universities can generate proportionately more vocational and professional job opportunities for their students than can the members of the consortium acting on their own.

POTENTIAL IMPACT OF REORGANIZATION

Over the years the multiplicity of relatively small institutions and the existance of five distinct boards of trustees, a statewide coordinating body, and a cabinet office for education have triggered a succession of attempts to reorganize public higher education in Massachusetts. The possibilities for reorganization are under active discussion at the present time by a commission jointly appointed by the governor and the legislature. At the same time, several powerful legislators have threatened to hasten the process by streamlining the organization of public higher education through cuts and consolidations in the state budget.

At present, most of the attention is focused on the Boston area; as a result, there exists a distinct possibility that in the near future The Boston Six may become The Boston Four or The Boston Two, or even The Boston One. It is therefore necessary to assess the prospect of such reorganization on the activities of The Boston Six.

Whatever the organizational configuration given by law to the public educational institutions in the Boston area, there will continue to be a variety of educational levels and fields about which prospective students require information and guidance. For this reason, the kind of activities developed by The Boston Six will still be needed. Retention of students, for example, will continue to be a major concern and mobility of students among programs a real need. Finally, the importance of developing innovative and coordinated entry-level services will not be diminished. A more unified administrative structure can only make these activities easier and more efficient.

LIMITATIONS OF INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

As mentioned earlier, the growing effectiveness of institutional cooperation among The Boston Six has not significantly lessened individual institutional activities. There have been some modifications and much coordination, but no move to subordinate individual operations to the cooperative ventures. The latter continue to be seen as welcome and effective complements, not as substitutes. Over time this outlook may

change somewhat, but short of reorganization of the institutions into The Boston One, it is neither likely nor desirable that the joint activities completely replace separate institutional operations.

A second limitation of the interinstitutional partnership is that it cannot quickly erase the natural competition among institutions. The past eighteen months have witnessed a remarkable increase in reciprocal trust and in willingness to cooperate, but there continues to be a sense that an institution is best presented, as well as represented, by someone from its own staff. This feeling is reinforced by a continuing consciousness of differences among institutions. Each institution wants to make sure that its interests are adequately guarded; quite understandably, this feeling is most pronounced in the smallest of the participants.

COMMENTS FROM INSTITUTIONAL PARTICIPANTS

In the preparation of this paper individuals who have participated in Boston Six activities were asked a number of questions about the effectiveness of the consortium. All who responded agreed that there was minimal interinstitutional cooperation among the six colleges before The Boston Six was formed. At best, colleagues with similar responsibilities and interests were acquainted, but few cooperative efforts had been initiated. Admissions personnel were acquainted with one another and persons with special interests, such as the assessment of prior learning, had worked together, but, in the main, there was more a sense of competition than cooperation before the project began.

Most would agree that in the beginning there was suspicion about the viability of a cooperative venture. After eighteen months all are pleased with the improved atmosphere among the institutional leadership. Anticipated difficulties simply did not appear. There has been a wellspring of good will and mutual respect.

Several respondents said that the primary benefit of the consortium was the opportunity for institutional leaders, especially presidents and chancellors, to meet for the first time as a group to address common concerns. Another respondent cited the considerable cooperation achieved among admissions officers, who must now function in an increasingly competitive market. This cooperation could only happen when these people were able to put aside their competitive stance in favor of one of trust. That this kind of cooperation has happened, and continues to happen, is a primary achievement of The Boston Six.

Although many respondents cited activities that were usually related to their own personal interests, they were nevertheless most impressed by the very fact that these six institutions, which compete with each other in many ways, have been able to seek out risky areas in which

cooperation proves valuable. For example, the first occasion for cooperation was in framing a joint proposal to seek funding; soon cooperation turned to sharing information. Now cross-registration, as well as a proposal for joint delivery of preentry services to nontraditional students, seems possible. More conversations about efforts to improve mobility are beginning to encourage action in these areas.

Nevertheless, there is a general agreement that the biggest limitation to cooperation has been the inevitable tension between institutional loyalties and the advantages of joint activity. Participants felt that more information about the activities and benefits of cooperation might have encouraged more joint efforts. Several respondents noted that participation itself encouraged more activity. Those institutional leaders who were kept informed of the initiatives of The Boston Six were more eager to support new projects. More intensive involvement may be necessary to promote even further the atmosphere of cooperation and to bring about a greater financial commitment. In fact, fiscal constraint was mentioned by most respondents as the primary factor inhibiting commitment to cooperation. But fiscal constraint works both ways. It is a negative force considering the difficulties of obtaining substantial institutional commitments; it is a positive one when institutions can see cost benefits in cooperative ventures.

All agreed that the political climate engendered by discussions about the reorganization of higher education in Massachusetts at times encouraged The Boston Six in its initiatives and at other times discouraged them. In fact, some observers have noted an overly cautious approach to the possibilities confronting The Boston Six. Several have noted a failure to implement much joint effort beyond "safe" informational activities.

Even considering these difficulties, however, there was unanimity on the overall value of the effort. One steering committee member, whose view is typical, observed: "This is a go-to-the-moon project. It takes an enormous investment of energy and a considerable lead time to achieve such a schema. So far, the effort has been modest; results are still well into the future. I believe they will be worth the effort."

Conclusion

If one accepts the basic premise that the educationally underserved population of American cities deserves access to all levels and categories

of higher education, then cooperation among the variety of relevant institutions brings many benefits. Such cooperation does not in and of itself assure improvement, but it is the best way to approach the many tasks that need to be accomplished. The Boston Six consortium has made encouraging progress and can, in a variety of ways, serve as an example to groups of institutions in other urban areas.

Improving Basic Skills in Birmingham

A Joint Effort by Retired Teachers, Miles College, and the Public Schools

by James R. Jordan

Birmingham, Alabama, the Steel City of the South, is heavily industrialized and has the largest population concentration in the state. Forty-two per cent of its 300,000 people are black. Historically, Birmingham has been an economic refuge for rural blacks escaping from deprivation. Most have settled in the inner city where they have become the chief victims of the urban problems that plague Birmingham. Among these problems are the widespread deficiencies in basic skills on the part of children in the school system—a problem that Miles College, a black institution with an outstanding record of leadership in the community, decided to attack at its roots. This is an account of SUPER (Skills Upgrading Program for Educational Reinforcement), an experimental project involving Miles, the schools, and retired teachers from the community.

One Small Victory

Richard, which is not his real name, was a disruptive eighth-grader. Noisy, disobedient, and mischievous, he continually called attention to himself by actions that were disrespectful to his teacher and distracting to his classmates. Richard's teacher and guidance counselor were aware that his test grades showed that he was far from performing on the eighth-grade level in basic mathematical and language skills, and they suspected that his aberrant behavior was related to his academic frustration.

Richard's counselor knew, too, that Richard wanted to be promoted out of the eighth grade and go on to high school. He wanted that badly, but his chances were small, for there were new pressures from the community against social promotions. With thirty-five others in her class, several with problems similar to Richard's, his teacher's capacities were stretched to the limit. She could not give Richard the extra help he needed, and he could not help himself.

The counselor struck a bargain with Richard. If he would enroll in the Miles College SUPER Tutorial Project at West End High School, he would not be removed from his class, and he might have a chance to graduate with his classmates and go on to West End High. Richard agreed, his parents concurred in the bargain, and Richard joined four other eighth-graders in one of West End's SUPER classes. The collective grade-equivalent scores in that class on reading, mathematics, and language subtests of the 1970 edition of the California Achievement Tests indicated that this group was performing four years and two months below its grade level.

Richard's SUPER tutor, who had nineteen other sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-graders in her class, had retired following many years of teaching in the Birmingham school system. No one knows precisely what she did for Richard or what caused him to change, but under her tutelage, Richard's school life began to alter. His guidance counselor and his teacher watched the transformation. Gradually, his schoolwork improved, his frustrations seemed fewer, and his attitudes and behavior took a turn for the better. "We don't know what the tutor did or how she did it, but she got to Richard and helped him," his counselor said.

Richard went on to high school, probably not fully caught up, but on his way. The counselor's bargain paid off. What will happen to Richard in high school no one can yet say, but he has a chance now to succeed. SUPER may have been a true victory, a real turning point, in Richard's life.

There are other stories like Richard's among the elementary and

secondary school students who have been tutored after school in English, reading, spelling, and mathematics by retired teachers from the Birmingham area school system. The students and their tutors are the central elements in the Miles College Skills Upgrading Program for Educational Reinforcement (SUPER). It was a cooperative experimental effort that brought together an urban-oriented, black college with the Birmingham and Fairfield school systems to help solve a pressing educational problem.

Declaration of War

Alabama's Governor Fob James had declared a "War on Illiteracy" when he campaigned for election in 1978. One of the battles of that war focused on deficiencies in the basic skills—reading, mathematics, and the use of language—among students attending and graduating from Alabama schools. Calling attention to these deficiencies created statewide concern among parents of schoolchildren, and resulted in the introduction of competency tests on basic skills for the various grade levels throughout Alabama's schools.

SCOUTING THE ENEMY

In the spring of 1977, national achievement tests administered in the Birmingham schools revealed that by the time students entered the tenth grade most were at least two grades behind in reading, mathematics, language, and spelling; some were even three grades behind in mathematics. The gap was cumulative, and it became startlingly noticeable after the eighth grade.

The Birmingham Chamber of Commerce had been aware of the problem because of the experience of its members in trying to employ high school graduates, to say nothing of school dropouts. As steel mills closed down, the city's economic base, though still heavily industrial, was swinging toward a service economy, and the job market was demanding different skills. Over and over again, chamber members had cited the difficulties young jobseekers had in filling out job application forms. Now the achievement test results starkly confirmed the employers' experiences. Genuinely alarmed, the chamber issued a public statement about the schools and called for a return to basic education. The statement recommended a new order of discipline in the schools, more

realistic teacher evaluation, professional development programs, smaller teacher-pupil ratios, and "proficiency and criteria" testing in basic skills and other subject matter. It called for the regular use of tests as educational tools, the documentation of student performance against specific objectives, a halt to social promotions, the restoration of the integrity of the high school diploma, and the development of attitudes more conducive to learning. The chamber's statement asked the boards of education to assess their school programs against these objectives and offered help in implementing the needed changes.

The school systems of metropolitan Birmingham were in the battle long before Governor James focused public attention on their shortcomings. Illiteracy surrounded the schools; their students' learning difficulties were born, in large part, of the social and economic deprivations that underlie Birmingham's other urban problems (white flight and a resulting shrinkage in the city's tax base; unemployment; the spread of urban blight and poverty; rising crime; racial tensions). Yet even as external forces labeled the schools a major part of the problem, those forces, too often, failed to supply the schools with the weapons needed to fight the battle.

A GENERAL CALL TO ARMS

Everyone seems to agree that the schools are going to have to do a much better job if Birmingham's urban ills are to be remedied. No one denies that the schools are not very effective now. Their failure is viewed as particularly alarming in the case of black students, who constitute about 50 per cent of their enrollments. But Birmingham is no longer content simply to cite the failure of its schools. Community leaders have now put education on their planning agendas. Birmingham's Board of Education has directed its administrators to draw up plans of attack on their problems for consideration and approval by the board. Schools are participating in various programs to provide individualized attention to students. Some of the programs are federally funded; some are undertaken in cooperation with local colleges. New kindergartens are being added to prepare students for primary and elementary learning, but there are not yet enough to meet the need. The lag in learning basic skills persists.

A Veteran in the Field. One knowledgeable observer of the Birmingham school scene, Executive Vice-President Alandus Johnson of Miles College, recently commented on the inability of the schools to cope with the problems of underprepared and underachieving students. He noted that there have been two decades of experimentation in elementary

education (the new math, for example), with few conclusive results. Although teacher education has improved, in his view an increasing trend toward specialization in teaching and a tendency for young teachers to go on to graduate study before acquiring classroom teaching experience may have introduced less experienced teachers to Birmingham's schools—teachers less able to approach the learning difficulties of unprepared students in a holistic way. Johnson questioned whether in-service teacher-training programs have been adequate to enhance the effectiveness of relatively inexperienced teachers, including those with graduate degrees. And he speculated that the academic quality of blacks entering careers in education may have declined as newly opened opportunities in other fields have diverted the more academically able from the field of education.

Nevertheless, according to Johnson, the basic cause for the Birmingham schools' failure to help the underachieving student overcome learning difficulties in the basic skills is the demands imposed on teachers by classloads of twenty-five to thirty-five students each. Time and effort required first to diagnose the difficulties that an individual underachiever is having and then to design an approach to help her or him overcome them is available to the teacher only at the cost of a loss in the learning momentum of those students who are achieving. Most often the teacher, the school, and the system have opted for continuing the mainstream movement toward the next grade. The underachievers have been carried forward although burdened by accumulating deficiencies in the basic skills that they sorely need for more advanced learning tasks.

MILES COLLEGE AS A CITADEL OF HOPE

Birmingham's accumulating deficit in basic skills and the reasons for it differ little from that of many other cities. But with 30,000 students in ninety elementary schools, Birmingham finds no solace in the fact that its problems are shared by the schools of other beleaguered cities. The Birmingham schools know there are no easy solutions, that the resources they can marshal are limited, and that the real challenge is to use existing resources in more innovative ways. The Miles College SUPER program was an attempt to do that. The college knew that if the skills deficit among Birmingham elementary students was not remedied, it would, in but a few years, increase the problems of the college as well as the community. To fully understand why the SUPER program was initiated by Miles rather than the schools, it is necessary to understand the historical importance of the college to the City of Birmingham.

Miles College is part and parcel of Birmingham. It is a four-year, private, coeducational black college sponsored by the Christian Meth-

odist Episcopal Church and accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. It now enrolls about 1,000 students each year. Located in metropolitan Birmingham, Miles is nestled in an essentially black neighborhood of Fairfield (population about 20,000), not far from the towering stacks of a cluster of giant steel mills.

Since its founding three quarters of a century ago, Miles College has consistently been a leader and a provider of leadership for its special constituency. From the days when advanced education for blacks led only to careers in teaching or preaching, Miles's leadership has never been passive about serving the educational needs of black people. It has pushed at the slowly opening frontiers of social, economic, and political opportunity; it has prepared and urged its graduates (one of them is now the mayor of Birmingham), while expanding its educational programs against severe economic odds that all but pulled it under in the sixties. In those tumultuous times Miles's students begged with tin cups on the streets of Birmingham to call attention to the needs of the college, and were dispersed by police dogs and firehoses. Those events thrust Miles into national prominence in the news media. More important, they exposed the depths of the city's problems and the plight of its black population. Those times also illuminated the importance of this small college not only to the black community so dependent on it, but also, eventually, to the total community. Ten years later in a commencement address at Miles, Chancellor Alexander Heard of Vanderbilt University paid tribute to the role Miles College plays in Birmingham: "Because Vanderbilt is part of a big city, too, I have a special vantage point from which to understand and appreciate the contributions that you have made toward creating a more just, open, dignified, constructive, integrated, democratic metropolitan community here in Birmingham."

For thousands of Birmingham's young blacks, Miles College has provided over the years the only road to opportunity; for other thousands today, it still represents the only avenue of escape from the confining walls of poverty and hopelessness. Other local educational institutions also offer opportunities, for example, the University of Alabama at Birmingham, which enrolls more than twice as many black students as does Miles. But Miles has always reached deeper as an academically and racially open institution to offer a chance to those who could not "make the cut" at any other college in the city. As one longtime observer of Miles and its struggles puts it: "To the black people of Birmingham... Miles College has a symbolic significance approaching that of the Statue of Liberty." Miles's President, W. Clyde Williams, expresses the relationship in more modest terms: "Miles has credibility as a community resource and a provider of education and educational services."

Because it has for so long been an avenue of hope, Miles today has an

educational obligation beyond that of maintaining a respectable collegiate program that sends forth graduates who can hold their own in a competitive society. The college must shoulder the burden of accepting ill-prepared high school graduates, help remedy their academic and social deprivations, and upgrade their skills so they can master college-level work. In effect, Miles must simultaneously operate a college and an academy within a financial structure barely able to sustain a college program adequately. It has no choice if it is to serve its primary constituents, too many of whom, for whatever reason and for far too long, have not acquired academic proficiency during their school years. The extra burden is financially onerous. Moreover, it is difficult for students to accept their need for remediation, and faculty members resist remedial instruction and prefer to teach the prepared student.

Miles is not alone in bearing such an added burden. All urban-based colleges and universities whose primary educational mission is to serve their local population face to some degree the necessity of overcoming at the college level the failures of the schools to serve the needs of minority students and others who have been economically and socially deprived. Few such colleges and universities see any chance of escaping this extra educational task in the near future. To escape, they would have to abandon their obligations to the neediest students and either not admit those who are educationally unprepared or admit and graduate them unprepared to compete in the world of work. Neither alternative is acceptable. The first would foreclose educational opportunity for disadvantaged students, and for the black colleges it would invite financial disaster. The second would constitute a crippling disservice to the deficient graduate. Until the schools find ways to teach *all* of their students to master basic skills, Miles, like many of its counterpart institutions around the country, has no choice but to help students remedy their deficiencies and to work more closely with the schools in that effort. The SUPER project is one example of how that can be done.

Miles estimates that 65 per cent to 70 per cent of its students are from metropolitan Birmingham. In 1978–1979, Birmingham's fourteen high schools and Fairfield High School produced 3,299 graduates. Variously, the high schools estimated that from 25 per cent to 71 per cent of their respective graduates would go on to college—an average of 44.01 per cent per high school. From twelve of the high schools for which data are available, Miles admitted about four hundred of their 1978–1979 graduates, about 15 per cent of the total—ranging by individual high school from 2.4 per cent to 27.7 per cent. Miles estimates that about 90 per cent of its students matriculating from metropolitan Birmingham high schools need, at the least, some remediation in basic skills. Thus, because more than half of the 1978–1979 graduates from high schools in

Birmingham did not go on to college and because 90 per cent of those graduates who did go on to Miles needed help with their basic skills, the urban community, the urban schools, and the urban-oriented college share mutually in a need to make elementary education more effective.

If education is to be a liberating force with which to break out of the cycle of poverty and despair, it must first be desired by the community, provided effectively by the schools, advanced and specialized by the colleges, and applied in the work of the community. Hence, in keeping with its historic mission, its identification with its urban community, and its own self-interest, Miles College has a stake in the search for ways to remedy the deficiencies in the basic skills of Birmingham's students long before they enter the working world or knock at the college's doors. It was out of these interrelated circumstances centered on the urban college and the urban community that the SUPER project at Miles emerged.

A Volunteer from Harvard. Miles already had considerable experience in correcting deficits in basic skills at both the college and school levels. Some seventeen years ago, the college's struggle and its courageous and creative leadership attracted the interest and gained the services of a former dean of Harvard College, John Munro. His unusual commitment and innovative instructional approaches produced a freshmen studies program that enabled Miles College to institute, in effect, a "thirteenth grade" in which to bring ill-prepared high school graduates up to collegiate levels in their skills. Miles has dramatic stories to tell of students who made quantum academic leaps against overwhelming odds. Munro's commitment and experience, after fifteen years at Miles, are currently benefiting students at Tougaloo College in neighboring Mississippi, and Miles carries on the work he began there, remedying the deficiencies of large numbers of its students who have been short-changed by their schooling.

A Broad Offensive. The white and the black communities of Birmingham joined hands in the late sixties primarily through the integrated Community Affairs Committee, which meets each week to discuss the city's most urgent problems and what can be done about them. The committee includes ten black members, one of whom is the president of Miles. (His predecessor at Miles was one of the committee's founding members.) Through President Williams's membership on the committee and in the Chamber of Commerce, and independently, Miles has turned increasingly to the search for ways to confront the problem of deficient skills among the city's schoolchildren. For example, the college has established both summer teacher-training institutes for black and white elementary schoolteachers to help them improve their teaching of

reading and mathematics and two-year graduate teaching internships in predominantly black elementary schools to address the problem from the instructional side. Another program uses college students to tutor schoolchildren. (Experience in this program has shown that the young tutors do a good job where understanding the children's emotional frustrations is important but that trained professionals are needed to fully address individual learning problems.) A dropout prevention program has served 400 eighth-graders identified as low achievers and potential dropouts, and a summer training program in mathematics for high school students has served forty-five high achievers a year to encourage and challenge them to proceed to college studies.

All of these efforts have been helpful in addressing parts of the school problem, but they have not reached down to the elementary levels or the majority of students needing help. The SUPER project has attempted to fill this gap by reinforcing the process of learning basic skills at the first-grade to eighth-grade levels.

A Well-Conceived Campaign: SUPER

The SUPER project was conceived by President Williams, who was responsible for directing Governor James's attention to the relationship between the problem of adult illiteracy and the basic skills problem in the schools. President Williams had many ideas for pursuing the needs of the black community through education and the enhancement of skills: upgrading the skills of black workers currently locked into low-paying jobs; upgrading the skills of elected black officials in meeting their responsibilities; and establishing a public radio station dedicated to the educational and cultural needs of the black community. Highest on his priority list, however, was the need to get at the basic skills problem in the schools. The number of dropouts continued to increase despite Miles's dropout prevention program. Noting the widening gap in skills proficiency after the eighth grade, President Williams decided that something needed to be done to get at the problem much earlier in a child's formal learning experience.

President Williams ventured his proposal for the SUPER project in response to an invitation from the Ford Foundation to take part in a grant competition involving selected urban-oriented colleges and universities around the country. A grant of $115,103 for a two-year

experiment beginning in the fall of 1978 set SUPER in motion under the supervision of Vice-President Johnson and the direction of a retired teacher from the Jefferson County school system, Mrs. Mildred Tucker. President Williams's active commitment to the program was a vital factor in its success.

RECRUITMENT AND INITIAL STRATEGIES

The nub of President Williams's idea for the SUPER Tutorial Project was the engagement of selected retired elementary school teachers to tutor elementary schoolchildren after regular school hours—students who were not performing at their grade level in the basic skills of English, spelling, reading, and mathematics. The objective was not to create a new instructional system, but rather to reinforce the classroom experience with more time and individual attention given by tutors with long experience in helping children to learn—tutors who possess a wealth of practical knowledge about the different ways children learn and who can draw upon a variety of strategies for serving those differences. On the logistical side, the retired teachers were an available part-time community resource. On the personal side, the retired teachers had an interest in supplementing their incomes (for some it was a necessity). They also had a desire to contribute to the community and to be professionally active.

Miles College had the enthusiastic cooperation of the school boards and superintendents in Birmingham and Fairfield. Without their commitment and follow-through with the school principals the project could not have worked. With the help of school officials, the college selected four tutorial sites on the basis of the greatest student needs as indicated by test scores. Thirteen elementary schools that served as feeders were arranged in clusters of three or four near each of the four tutorial sites. These sites became "community schools" devoted to a host of educational enrichment programs after school hours. Each site in Birmingham served an inner-city area that is severely distressed and predominantly black. Alabama Hall on the Miles College campus and Miles's nearby Learning Center provided the tutorial site to serve Fairfield's three elementary schools and one middle school. Two of the sites in Birmingham were high schools and one was an elementary school. Proximity of a student's elementary school to the tutorial site was an important factor, because students ranging from first grade to eighth grade had to get to the sites by 3:30 p.m. (just one hour after the closing time of their regular schools) and then home following the two-hour tutoring sessions.

Eleven retired teachers were selected in the beginning, including the ubiquitous director, Mrs. Tucker, who, because of her long teaching experience, broad acquaintance among Birmingham educators, and

involvement in numerous community activities, was well prepared to identify likely candidates among the retired teachers in the metropolitan area and to guide the selection process. Other teachers and administrators nominated retired teachers, and the Birmingham Retired Teachers Association endorsed the project and provided names from its membership. The retirees were employed by Miles College. They were selected on the basis of criteria that called for a bachelor's or a master's degree, teacher certification, and validated experience over several years in the teaching of basic skills in the elementary field. Teaching skill and experience were regarded as more important than possessing a Ph.D.

During the first two years of SUPER's operations, nineteen retired teachers were involved in tutoring. Their teaching experience ranged from twelve years to forty-seven; nine of them had taught more than thirty years each before retiring. They had taught mainly in the elementary schools of Birmingham and Fairfield and in those of Jefferson County, but the group's experience included teaching in six other Alabama towns, in Detroit, Michigan, and in Miles College and Lawson State Community College. All held bachelor's degrees, and some had done various levels of graduate work. Both men and women were employed, and all were black, which was felt to be important in establishing rapport with the children, the vast majority of whom were blacks. The retired teachers' ages ranged from 51 to 79, with an estimated average age of 60 years.

The tutors were expected to use the methods they had developed in long years of teaching; however, to inform them about methods currently in use in the schools and new methods of instruction, Miles held two workshops for the tutors, one in English and the other in mathematics. Experts in these areas, drawn from the college and from the school system's headquarters, were brought in to conduct the workshops.

The 1978 test results from the Birmingham schools helped pinpoint the inner-city communities having the greatest need for the SUPER project; the results also identified the students with the most severe deficiencies. Since Fairfield had no systemwide testing, teachers and counselors there identified the neediest pupils by examining classroom test results and report cards from prior semesters. Only students in grades one through eight were selected for the SUPER project. The rationale was that remedial assistance in the lower grades and no later than the eighth grade would give the deficient student the best chance to catch up and to succeed in high school. Each student was recommended by a teacher or guidance counselor, or both, and in a few cases by the school principal. No student was accepted without a parent's approval in writing.

Besides using test results and grades to identify educable but low-

achieving students, teachers and counselors also drew upon other evidence of learning frustration in selecting students for the SUPER project. Such signs as poor attendance, minimum participation in school activities, differences in social and physical maturity because of being held back at various grade levels, and behavioral problems like Richard's, also figured in the recommendations. Director Tucker is satisfied, however, that teachers and counselors did not misuse the SUPER project by shunting students out of the classrooms simply because they were misbehaving.

Parental support for the program was enthusiastic. Vice-President Johnson believes that Governor James's campaign had heightened the awareness of parents, particularly young parents who knew firsthand about the problems of applying for, getting, and holding jobs when deficient in basic skills. Generally, parents of SUPER students sought to push their children to achieve in school and, where their educational background permitted, sought to reinforce them with help at home.

A total of 328 students was enrolled for the fall, winter, and spring terms of the 1978 school year. Two were white children; the rest were black. All were tested by the Miles College Testing Center for grade placement purposes. The test results provided the tutors with a starting point for each student and a basis for grouping two or three grade levels where appropriate in one class under one tutor. The aim was to have from eighteen to twenty students per teacher grouped by contiguous grades. The enrollment exceeded the desired ratio, but throughout the year, because of attendance patterns, each tutor averaged about twenty students per day. For the 1979 summer program (June and July), 166 students were enrolled, some new to the program and others continuing on from the earlier sessions; each summer tutor averaged about fifteen students per day.

LOSSES AND GAINS ON THE LONG MARCH

The weekly class schedule originally was arranged to provide each child with two three-hour sessions on consecutive days throughout the regular school year. Because of the age of the children, this schedule was found to be too concentrated and to extend too late into the evening, particularly during the winter months. It was therefore soon reduced to two hours a day, twice a week, every other day. In the summer, the tutoring sessions were scheduled for four hours a day, Monday through Thursday, over a period of seven weeks. Attendance figures during the 1979 regular school year clearly indicated that bad weather and early darkness in the winter months took their toll in the attendance records, particularly of smaller children. Consequently, the decision was made to operate the project in

1979 on an interrupted schedule from September through November, and March through May, reducing the number of total sessions from ninety-two in 1978 to seventy-four in 1979.

Some loss of enrollment was also caused by families moving out of the participating school districts. That and the promotion of eighth-graders to high school resulted in a decline from 328 at the beginning of the 1978 school year to 280 students at the beginning of 1979. The decline was not unexpected by Director Tucker, but she was pleasantly surprised when enrollment at the site with the least number of students jumped in the spring of 1980 bringing overall enrollment up to 302 students—twenty-two more than in the fall of 1979 and only twenty-six less than in the fall of 1978. In the summer of 1980, enrollment was 199. This included fifty-seven new students, bringing the total number participating in SUPER to 359 students. These figures suggest the continuing value placed on the program by students, parents, and schools.

Absenteeism, poor attitudes, and misbehavior were not treated lightly. The tutors noted that students with special problems or without a strong sense of responsibility usually had lower attendance records. Tutors observed that students exhibiting poor classroom behavior, lack of respect for the property of others, and other antisocial and antischool attitudes were often older and bigger than others in their class. In some cases, tutors attributed poor behavior to inadequate parental concern and devotion. The importance of regular attendance was stressed by the tutors directly to their students, but in addition, the tutors used the intervening day in each operating week to telephone and to make visits to parents and classroom teachers. In these conversations, regular attendance again was stressed, and special efforts were made by the tutors to reach the parents of irregular attendees. The calls and visits also included discussions of student performance and academic progress and praise for the parents whenever a student had been awarded a certificate for perfect attendance or had been cited for a particular achievement by the SUPER project. This classroom and home feedback, according to Director Tucker, was particularly important in cementing supportive relationships for the project.

The relatively good attendance record, except during the deep winter months, suggests that what went on in the tutorial sessions motivated the students to participate regularly in this totally voluntary, after-school program. What did go on has not yet been completely documented and analyzed, but it is clear that the emphasis on individual attention was a critical factor in student performance. The central focus was on the basic skills that the individual student needed to master before progressing to the next academic level. The learning objectives for each successive grade level determined the order of progression in teaching each basic

skill, but the tutor's approach and the materials used were not necessarily those used in each student's regular classroom. The seasoned teacher/tutors had a free hand in diagnosing the problems of individual students in learning skills and in using the approach and materials that worked best for each child. Using workbooks they had selected and learning materials they had created, the tutors assigned work to be completed by the student working alone, to be turned in at a certain time, and to be done neatly. Disciplined work habits were stressed as values important to academic achievement.

Although the SUPER project concentrated on the cognitive aspects of upgrading basic skills, it also had a variety of personal and social objectives thought to affect learning achievement:

- to develop the effective use of communication (oral) skills
- to assist in elevating the standards of education in the schools
- to assist administrators, principals, teachers, and parents as necessary
- to prevent students from dropping out of school
- to help students develop both a sense of responsibility and self-respect, learn how to get along with others, and to follow instructions
- to help create better teacher-pupil relationships
- to develop better relations between home and school

Some strategies for achieving this formidable list of objectives were inherent in the project's design, but the tactics for altering attitudes and changing behavior were largely left to the retired teachers' personal and professional resources, accumulated during years of teaching and caring about their students. The tutors frequently lavished attention on the misbehavers. A printed "Student of the Month Certificate" that was personally signed by President Williams, Vice-President Johnson, and Director Tucker was used to build student incentive and parental encouragement. The principal of Carver High School observed: "These retired teachers establish and enforce discipline in their classes, but, at the same time, they show the kids they love them." He added that today's younger teachers are inhibited in their relationships with students because they fear that the exercise of discipline may lead to legal action against them.

BROADENING THE OFFENSIVE

Because Director Tucker once taught troubled youngsters to whom the courts had given the option of attending school or undergoing court-prescribed penalties, the SUPER project included occasional lectures

and films on drugs, drinking, sex education, smoking, and other problems encountered in urban street life. Her experience led her to believe that traumatic encounters with such matters often inhibited and interrupted academic progress, and that information received in advance of such experiences could prevent school problems and school dropouts.

The project also provided a sprinkling of enrichment activities to introduce the students to experiences, environments, and social settings outside the classroom. During the 1978 school year, ninety-three students made a field trip to the Birmingham Zoo, followed by a picnic and a bus tour of important sights of the city. Twenty-five students enjoyed a performance of *The Wiz* at Birmingham's Civic Center. Similar events were sponsored in 1979. For some of the students these outings were first experiences that became, according to the director, "days to remember."

Mindful of the College's urban orientation and the project's dependence upon the cooperation of the community and the schools, the SUPER staff undertook various kinds of public relations activity. They arranged for occasional media coverage of the project; they made the project a part of the college's annual Community Awards Banquet; and they organized and consistently involved a wide cross section of the community in planning and development through an advisory board of nineteen members. The banquet event included parents as well as community leaders involved in the SUPER project, some of whom were recognized with certificates of appreciation for their support and cooperation. The advisory board membership included SUPER project administrators as ex-officio members. The board's officers were: president, a retired principal of the Jefferson County school system; vice-president, a principal and representative of the Fairfield Board of Education; secretary, a retired teacher from the Fairfield schools; and assistant secretary, the Chairman of the Division of Foreign Languages of Lawson State Community College. The other board members were the Acting Director of Clinical Experiences at the University of Alabama at Birmingham, the Chairman of the Division of Education of Miles College, a principal from the Birmingham school system, two parents, several counselors and a testing expert from Miles College and the Birmingham and Fairfield schools, a retired teacher, the information officer of the City of Birmingham, and a program specialist from the Birmingham Board of Education. The project administrators informed the advisory board about the tutorial project's operations in detail and actively sought the board's advice in quarterly meetings. According to Mildred Tucker, the board maintained a high level of interest and participation.

COSTS OF THE CAMPAIGN

Miles College budgeted and managed the grant funds with care. The first-year expenses were budgeted at $55,015, the second at $49,625. Instructional materials ($3,340) and office supplies and equipment ($4,425) were necessary first-year expenditures. Personnel expenses absorbed the largest part of the funds with $22,000 each year for the Director's Office and $20,000 for tutors for each academic year and summer session. Local travel, workshops, student enrichment activities, and evaluation and indirect costs, which amounted to about 10 per cent each year, consumed the balance of the grant funds. In-kind contributions from the schools, which may never be capitalized, included space for the tutorial sites and the time and effort of school personnel. These costs were absorbed in the regular operations of the schools and did not overburden those enterprises. The project director recommended at the close of the first year that honoraria given the tutors ($100 per month each for the academic year and for the summer session) be increased to $150. Had additional funds been available, she also would have recommended that an after-school snack be provided for the children, because many from families with working parents came directly from school to the tutoring sessions without a chance to raid the family larder.

Because enrollment levels were not constant—students entered at different times and some went in and out of the program—it is difficult to provide a precise per-student cost figure. But by any measure it was low. Using the 359 different students enrolled in the SUPER project as a divisor, the per-student cost of the two years in grant funds ($115,000) was about $320. If uncapitalized expenses could be prorated and added, the per-student cost would still be an educational bargain.

ASSESSMENTS OF THE OUTCOME

SUPER aspired to raise the individual student's performance in the basic skills by two grade levels. There were no projectwide test data available at the close of the first year with which to measure the impact of the program. However, reading test scores for forty-nine students from one school had been compiled by the counselor, and they strongly suggested that SUPER might achieve its aspirations for at least some of the students. The observations and comments of parents and teachers were also strongly supportive at the halfway point in the program.

A first-grade teacher observed: "I have seen remarkable improvement in their math and reading skills." A second-grade teacher said, "I believe the program has been a very good skill-improving activity for this child. And I also feel it has added to his attitude and desires to achieve in the

classroom." Parents spoke of observing improvement in their children's schoolwork and noted that children were "bringing home better grades." A principal stated: "Children involved in this program develop better work and study habits. Records show that these children have made substantial scholastic progress."

When SUPER completed its second year, it had involved 359 different students and had approximately 150–160 test scores on Form A of the California Achievement Test, the pretest, and about 345 scores on Form B, the post-test, all collated to the grade level in which each student was enrolled. Perfect statistical comparisons by grade level could not be made, because different students enrolled for different periods of time at each grade level and some students had not taken both a pretest and a post-test for one reason or another. The data, however, were considered to be adequate for a first cut at analysis. The Director of Testing at Miles College computed the total mean grade equivalent scores on the three subtests on reading, language, and mathematics. He explained that the three scores were considered together, because the skills they test are related to one another and must be developed sequentially. He cautioned that the mean score does not say that every student performed at the total mean grade equivalent level, but the mean indicates a central tendency—a value typical of each grade group. He also computed, where comparative analyses were possible, the total mean grade equivalent gain and cautioned that each student had not made that gain; some made less and some made more, but the gain indicates the central tendency of the group.

The analyses indicated that SUPER did not achieve its aspirations to effect a two-year gain for each student, an expectation that, in retrospect, may have been unrealistic. Nonetheless, there were gains. Despite only one term in the program, twenty-six first-graders performed at the first-grade level on the post-test. The mean grade equivalent score for the thirty-three second-graders was 2.5; for twenty-eight third-graders, 3.1; for thirty fourth-graders, 3.6; for fifty-nine fifth-graders, 5.1; for thirty-nine sixth-graders, 5.9; for thirty-three seventh-graders, 5.5; and for thirty-seven eighth-graders, 5.4. The Miles analysis explained that the performance below grade level of the sixth-through-eighth-grade groups must be considered in the light of the fact that the level of difficulty of the material to be learned increases in direct proportion to the grade level. Achieving successively higher grade levels is more difficult for those who have fallen behind in the earlier grades, because the learning deficit is cumulative. The gains they did make are particularly significant, however, as indicators of new motivation, added self-confidence, and improved attitudes toward their studies.

Data were not available for comparative analysis of the performance

of the first-graders, but the second-graders' mean gain in equivalent grade level was one month; for the third-graders, eight months. The fourth-graders achieved the most, registering a mean gain of one full year. The fifth-graders gained seven months as did the sixth-graders. The seventh-graders gained six months, and the eighth-graders gained two months.

It should be pointed out that SUPER was designed for disadvantaged students and accepted students of differing innate abilities. Most of them had one thing in common, a deficit in the basic skills—failure to perform these skills at the level of the grade in which they were enrolled in regular school. The students were grouped for tutoring according to their regular grade levels, but within that grouping they were tutored as individuals in the basic skills while tutors sought to discover and counter the factors that contributed to their learning difficulties in the first place. Some of those factors—such as adverse home and environmental circumstances or health conditions—were beyond SUPER's reach, but it could and did seek to surmount the effects of low self-esteem, lack of self-confidence, lack of motivation—all interrelated in their influence upon learning and school performance.

The use of arithmetic means to express grade equivalent scores and grade equivalent gains suggests that some students made no gains or little progress while others made much better, even outstanding gains. One second-grader performed at very nearly the fifth-grade level, one third-grader exceeded the fifth-grade level, a fourth-grader reached a level of seven months into the sixth grade, several fifth-graders performed several months above the seventh grade, and four sixth-graders' test scores exceeded the ninth-grade level, one exceeding the twelfth-grade standard and another that of the tenth grade. Others made less dramatic gains but did exceed their grade levels by more than one grade.

SUPER expected its tutoring to produce measureable gains in performance in the basic skills through individual achievements to help reverse the psychological effects of cumulative failure and to encourage positive attitudes toward study and new confidence to be carried back into regular classrooms. For assessment of these less quantifiable values, SUPER depended upon experienced observers of children in school.

Some Well-Earned Battle Ribbons. In the course of the project, both tutors and regular classroom teachers carefully noted changes in classroom deportment of individual students—such as Richard's turn-about from hostility and frequent visits to the principal's office to cooperation and interest in his schoolwork. Tutors ascribed improved attendance to improved academic performance. They observed that students worked more independently and voluntarily, demonstrated

greater respect for their peers and their tutors, gave more attention to instructions about caring for school property, participated in activities, and communicated more openly with tutors about the pressures of street problems. Teachers detected similar behavior in the regular classrooms and ascribed them to changes in student self-esteem and self-confidence flowing from improved academic performance. A fourth-grade teacher commented: "I have noticed not only a more enriched student but also a more excited one." Another said: "The Tutorial Program has been very instrumental in helping my students academically and socially." One parent reported: "I don't have to tell my son to go to school now; he voluntarily gets his books and goes." In a similar vein, another said: "My children like coming to the classes and the teachers they are working with." Still another commented on the summer tutoring: "I'm sure my son will do better in winter school after having been on his own in summer school."

The project's administrators are certain the project has contributed to a new level of mutual appreciation and cooperation among schools, teachers, and parents. The goal of improving the quality of education in the regular classrooms is more difficult to assess, but the administrators believe that the feedback from tutors to classroom teachers helped the teachers to deal more effectively with problem students, and, in all probability, influenced the teachers' instructional effectiveness with other students.

There was a consensus among tutors, classroom teachers, parents, and students that the SUPER project had proven to be a successful experiment. The adults involved directly and indirectly with SUPER gave their assessments of the project's achievement in motivation and performance with conviction. The direct beneficiaries—the students themselves—wrote with simple eloquence:

I think the program is helping me a lot. It helps me to understand different things I need to know.

. . . it teaches me things I need to know. I used to hate math, but now I like math and English. Math is my best subject now.

I wanted to improve in math. In class we do problems to help us understand this work. The teacher wants us to learn and I am trying very hard.

I just love Tutorial Program, and it has helped me read in my right grade. Now I'm happy and proud.

. . . I am so proud of myself. I have improved in my subjects. I like this program because it helps me a lot. . . it gives me the ability and courage to learn more.

It was fine
It was all right
One thing about it
I get my lessons right.

The Campaign in Retrospect

The point has been clearly demonstrated that retired elementary teachers are a valuable community resource that can be effectively organized in a cooperative attack on the lagging comprehension of basic skills among the community's schoolchildren. The atmosphere of the tutorial classroom, the genuine appreciation and affection shown by the students for their tutors, and the dedication and vitality of the retired teachers in their SUPER tutoring showed beyond doubt that retired teachers everywhere can be a strong ally in cooperative efforts to solve the basic skills problems of in-school youth.

In terms of cost, the SUPER experiment was reasonable, although it probably would cost more to continue it as an ongoing program. Even at a higher cost, especially to provide more equitable rewards for the retired teachers, the program expenditure might be justified as an effective approach to a problem that the schools, as yet, have not been able to solve on their own.

Experimentally, the 359 students involved in the project represented no more than one-third to one-half of the students needing special assistance, according to the estimates of the principals of three of the ten elementary schools covered by the project. To reach those most in need in the Birmingham-Fairfield school systems would require a considerable expansion of the project to dimensions probably beyond the capacity of one small urban-oriented college to mount and manage with the full cooperation of the schools. Even were SUPER to be expanded substantially, President Williams believes that the basic skills deficiency problem in Birmingham will persist for at least another ten years.

Moves to Regroup

After the experimental phase of SUPER ended at the close of the summer session, the program entered a hiatus during which President

Williams and the SUPER staff set out to summarize and analyze the SUPER experience and to report to the urban community. They had two objectives: the first, to convert a successful experiment into a continuing program in the Birmingham-Fairfield area; the second, to introduce other communities to SUPER and to discuss the potentials that a similar program might hold for similar problems confronting them.

A supplemental grant from the Ford Foundation will support these efforts. Miles College, with the help of educational psychologist, Dr. Samuel Tucker of Atlanta's Human Development Center, will undertake to mine the SUPER experience to learn all that can be extracted, in retrospect. Emphasis will be placed on determining how effective and practical the program was, how its design and execution might be improved, and how its experience can be fed back into regular classrooms. Miles will convene three workshops, one in Birmingham, another in a rural county in Alabama, and a third as a regional meeting in Atlanta. The workshops will involve specially concerned groups in each case—educators, parents, school leaders, and the business community—to discuss the SUPER experience in the light of different local circumstances. A fourth workshop will summarize the first three and assess the applicability of SUPER in other settings.

In the meantime, President Williams has been reporting the SUPER experience to the Birmingham and Fairfield communities. His appearances before the Retired Teachers Association, the Young Business Executive Club, the Community Affairs Committee of Operation New Birmingham, and discussions with school leaders have elicited responses of encouragement for the continuation of SUPER. Equally encouraging have been the calls from parents of schoolchildren asking when SUPER will again be available for their children.

The effects of a recession and consequent constraints upon school budgets currently limit the possibilities of mustering local funds to continue and enlarge SUPER in the Birmingham-Fairfield community. Nevertheless, in its formative stage, SUPER had attracted the interest of Alabama's governor, who had spoken publicly of his special concern for the basic skills problem. And the Federal Community Services Administration had shown early interest in SUPER as a promising idea with possibilities for replication in other communities. President Williams has responded to those earlier expressions of interest with information about SUPER's results. Though cautious in voicing his expectations, he is confident there will be a continuing interest and possibly support for SUPER's resumption in Alabama's principal urban center. And though SUPER was a project of an urban institution in and for its own community, President Williams hopes the SUPER experience may have pointed the way to effective collaboration between other urban colleges

and their communities. Recently Miles College received a grant for building renovations, which was awarded through the Alabama Office of State Planning and Federal Programs from funds of the Appalachian Regional Commission. President Williams believes the grant may reflect, in part, a new appreciation for Miles College and its needs—an appreciation not unrelated to SUPER.

There is no standard definition of an urban-oriented college, but central to the concept is a relationship of interdependency. Miles College and the Birmingham community share such an interdependency. The educational problems of the community are also the educational problems of the college. To the extent that the SUPER project is finally judged to have contributed to the solution of one of these problems, Miles College will have benefited both itself and the people and community to which it is so closely tied.

Community Outreach in Hartford

A Higher Education Program for Hispanics

by Gail Spangenberg,
with Morton Coleman and Jeffrey Daniels

Introduction

In many cities around the country, Hispanics are the fastest growing segment of the population. As their numbers grow, so do their demands that schools and institutions of higher education respond more affirmatively to their distinctive educational needs.

At present, the Hispanic rate of participation in higher education is disproportionately low. Among the reasons for this are financial hardship, restricted access to counseling and information programs, inadequate basic skills and English proficiency, and an erosion of self-confidence and self-esteem brought on by difficulties of assimilation and failures of the school system. One city where these forces are at work is Hartford, Connecticut. The Hartford situation and one recent initiative in Hartford to improve the rate at which Hispanics in that area go to college are the subject of this paper.

In late 1978, the University of Hartford received a grant from the Ford Foundation for an experimental outreach project known as the Hartford

Higher Education Hispanic (HHEH) Program. Following a few months of preliminary planning and development the program was launched in the high schools and the community early in 1979; participating along with the university were the Hartford State Technical College and The Greater Hartford Community College. The program included unusual recruitment approaches: academic and nonacademic counseling and guidance, tutoring in the basic skills and English, and other support services, all in a college campus environment. The aim was to find and work with Hispanics who, without the special help the program offered, would probably never attend college.

This paper examines the program as it has developed during the last year and a half—with particular attention to why it was needed, its accomplishments and problems, and its continuing usefulness in Hartford and perhaps to others trying to improve opportunities for Hispanics in higher education. While preparing the paper, we had access to university and Ford Foundation project files; we also consulted with people in the three higher education institutions, with the project staff and students, and with others familiar with some aspect of the project or its city context.

The Project: Needed in Hartford

The greater Hartford area has a population of about 800,000, of which some 140,000 live in the City of Hartford. Hartford is troubled by the same problems as many of its larger urban counterparts: for example, a changing population; outmigration of middle-income people to the suburbs; changes in the labor structure owing to the loss in recent years of manufacturing jobs; and deterioration of municipal services. The current population of Hartford is about two-thirds minority and one-third white. Adjusted 1970 census data indicate that blacks are currently stabilized at about 30 per cent of the Hartford population. Hispanics made up 8 per cent of the population in 1970, but their numbers have grown very rapidly in the past decade. Current estimates for Hispanics range from 20 per cent to 35 per cent of the population. School enrollment, as based on actual headcount data collected annually by the Hartford school board, showed that Hispanics—the majority of them Puerto Rican—accounted for about 36 per cent of the public school enrollment in 1979, up from 33 per cent only a year before. (Blacks accounted for about 47 per cent.) That is four times the percentage of

only a decade ago, and there is every sign of continuing growth both in Hispanic school enrollment and the Hispanic population generally.

Federal census data indicate that in 1975 the median income of Hispanics in Connecticut was $8,462, about half that of the general population. Some 60 per cent of Hispanics (and only a slightly lesser percentage of blacks) were classified as below the poverty level in the state. Although state and local data on income are not available in very useful or up-to-date form, federal data are current. They indicate generally that the great majority of Hispanics are concentrated in the inner cities, both nationally and in the State of Connecticut. Very probably their numbers relative to the Hartford population are even larger than those shown above. There has been so much volatility in unemployment rates and in Hispanic migration and immigration patterns over the last few years that there is at present considerable disagreement in Hartford and in the state about the unemployment rate of Hartford Hispanics. Connecticut's Department of Labor places it at around 18 per cent (as contrasted to 10 per cent–12 per cent for the city as a whole), but Hispanic community groups in Hartford estimate the rate to be as high as 30 per cent to 40 per cent for Hispanics generally and even higher for Hispanic youth. However imprecise the data, it seems clear that Hispanics in Hartford are disproportionately impoverished and unemployed.

In any case, there is no doubt about the dramatic change in the makeup of Hartford's public school enrollment (from 48 per cent minority in 1965 to 85 per cent now). The change has occurred so swiftly that the school system has been unable to shift gears quickly enough to meet the new demands placed upon it. As a result, large numbers of students (particularly Hispanics) drop out or graduate without adequate skills. According to the local school board, 90 per cent of Hispanic high school students in Hartford drop out. In short, the odds are overwhelmingly against a Hispanic going to college.

Even for Hispanic high school students who do graduate, the probability of attending college is low. In 1974 only 81 Hispanic students were in attendance in Hartford's three largest institutions of higher education (the three participating in the HHEH program), and more than a third of the students were not from the Hartford area. By early 1979, the situation had improved only slightly. Fewer than 200 Hispanics were then enrolled in the three institutions. Ninety were at the University of Hartford, four at the Hartford State Technical College, and the rest at The Greater Hartford Community College.

The city's showing of proportionately low college enrollments of Hispanic students parallels that of the state. A 1977 report by La Casa de Puerto Rico, a Hartford-based advocacy and research organization,

noted that in 1974 "the total enrollment in Connecticut's public and private colleges was 75,763 full-time undergraduates, with Spanish-surnamed students comprising 1.3 percent of the population."* Fewer than 1,000 Hispanic students were enrolled in public and private colleges and universities statewide.

The La Casa study included a survey of Puerto Rican high school graduates in Connecticut. It found that 67 per cent were either unaware of higher education services and programs available to them, or, if they were aware, they needed help identifying specific institutions and programs suited to their circumstances—help that was for the most part not available. Moreover, according to La Casa, the great majority of the graduates saw no prospect for help with the learning skills and language proficiency needed to succeed in college. La Casa's work also confirmed that for the majority of Hispanics in the state lack of financial aid, partly a problem of knowing how to get it, is a major obstacle to their participation in higher education.

In its 1977 study, La Casa concluded that reform is needed in several areas to increase the number of Puerto Rican and other Hispanic students who enroll in and graduate from Connecticut colleges and universities. Among its recommendations were programs to improve the academic preparation of Hispanics, the development of learning situations that provide Hispanic role models, a much higher level of preentry and postentry counseling, and active recruitment programs in the admissions and financial aid offices of higher education institutions.

It was in this setting that the Hartford Higher Education Hispanic (HHEH) Program was launched.

A Mixed History of Service

The three institutions that participated in the HHEH program are city oriented in varying degrees—The Greater Hartford Community College, by its very nature, having the strongest city orientation. The three have a mixed history of service to the disadvantaged ethnic and racial groups of the Hartford area, and a particularly low level of service to Hispanics. Like public and private institutions in many other cities, they have tended to operate in relative isolation from and indifference toward each

*Adrianna Falcon-Trafford, et al., *Where Do We Go from Here?* Hartford, Conn.: La Casa de Puerto Rico, Inc., 1977, p. 30.

other. Yet there were good reasons for the three institutions to work together in developing the HHEH program, and for the University of Hartford to serve the lead role and to house the project. A brief look at some of the characteristics and recent history of the institutions may help explain why.

THE GREATER HARTFORD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The Greater Hartford Community College, founded in 1967, occupies five floors of a six-story building (formerly used by an insurance company) in the Asylum Hill section of Hartford. The neighborhood is racially mixed and is near a downtown area that has various public and private rehabilitation programs. Under state mandate, the college maintains a totally open admissions policy. It seeks through in-service courses, adult education, television courses, and other day and evening programs to allow a full range of students to be enrolled. The college has developed links to the local corporate community for which it provides a variety of special training programs. It has an annual enrollment of about 1,700 full-time, and full-time equivalent, students, a level it may not exceed by state order. Since about two-thirds of its students are part-time, the college actually enrolls by headcount about 3,000 students annually. Sixty per cent of its students are city residents. In early 1979, less than 1 per cent of its students were Hispanic.

The college was criticized by Hispanic community leaders a few years ago for its low level of service to Hispanics. Since then it has been struggling to improve its performance by providing English-as-a-second language (ESL), remedial, and other programs and services. It has done so despite a tight budget, space limitations, and a feeling on the part of many that the state is awakening too slowly to the college's problems vis-à-vis the needs of its inner city constituency. The college is still a relatively young institution, one of many in the country that was created during the sixties when state and federal education budgets were still expanding. Like its counterparts elsewhere, the college is now caught between, on the one hand, reduced state support, and, on the other, rising demand for special services and programs for the disadvantaged learner.

HARTFORD STATE TECHNICAL COLLEGE

Hartford State Technical College, originally called the Connecticut Engineering Institute, opened in 1946 and is part of the state's regional technical college system. It offers associate-in-science degrees in six fields in engineering technology as well as in architecture, chemistry, and

data processing. The college is located on Flatbush Avenue next to a secondary vocational school whose physical appearance it resembles. It is surrounded by both city and federally owned public housing projects in a neighborhood that is composed predominantly of blacks and other minorities. Both state and local Hispanic leaders have criticized the college, and indeed the state's entire technical college system, for being elitist. But the college has shown some movement in recent years toward a more liberal enrollment policy. The college draws its students from some seventy-five high schools across the state, but the majority come from the suburbs of Hartford. Its annual enrollment is about 850 full-time day students and an equal number of part-time evening students. In 1979, only four of its students were Hispanic. As a public institution, the college is also caught in a squeeze between limited support from the state and increased demand for its services.

UNIVERSITY OF HARTFORD

The University of Hartford, an independent institution, and by far the largest in the area, was established in its present form in 1957 through a merging of Hillyer College, Hartt School of Music, and the Hartford Art School. Its oldest predecessor, the Hartford Art School, goes back to 1877. The university has a comprehensive educational program and offers degrees from the associate through the doctoral levels. It has a variety of nondegree programs as well.

The university is located on the boundary of Hartford and West Hartford, bridging the city and the suburbs. One side of its campus is in the predominantly white middle-class area of West Hartford, and the opposite side is adjacent to a predominantly black neighborhood containing one of the city's largest low-income housing projects. The university's facilities are generally less crowded and more attractive than those of the two public institutions.

The university serves the needs of the state and Northeast region as well as local needs. Out of a 1979 enrollment of about 3,800 full-time students and 5,000 to 6,000 part-time students, including both graduates and undergraduates, about one-fourth were listed as Hartford area residents and the rest were from other communities in the state or beyond its borders. As noted, ninety of these students were Hispanic, twenty-eight of them full-time. Of course, enrollment makeup alone is not an accurate reflection of the university's role in the educational affairs of the city, nor of its potential for addressing local education problems. In fact, the university operates an array of bilingual and special programs and services for the benefit of disadvantaged learners in the city and the state. To illustrate:

In 1977–1978, when the Ford Foundation first began to look at grant prospects in Hartford, the university had forty-seven separate contracts to provide training programs for various social service agencies in the state, including some in Hartford. These efforts were expected to benefit several thousand individuals. The university's College of Education and Allied Services was operating a variety of special programs, among them a graduate bilingual education program for teachers in the Hartford school system, an Equal Education Institute to train people working in the field of desegregation, and a New Careers Program for paraprofessionals wishing to earn undergraduate college credit. The university's Barney School of Business and Public Administration, in cooperation with Hartford's primary and secondary schools, was running a program to improve engineering and science opportunities for minorities. Under funding from the Aetna Life and Casualty Foundation of Hartford, the university's Ward Technical College had developed an electromechanical technology program for high school students from the inner city. And in other parts of the university numerous projects in bilingual education were under way, including a major program conducted in cooperation with the University of Puerto Rico.

There is little basis for assessing the effectiveness of these programs; they are cited simply to show that the university has accumulated a wide capability in bilingual education and other programs geared to the needs of disadvantaged youth and adults. Further, the university has well-established language and learning laboratories—absolutely essential to a program like the HHEH program—and a variety of bilingual materials that have been tested over time. It also has a higher percentage of full-time Hispanic faculty members than any other college or university in Connecticut, though in 1979 none were on a tenure track, according to one university official. Moreover, the interaction among the university's range of graduate and undergraduate programs and faculty makes possible a rich environment for students to whom a sense of belonging to a "bona fide" academic community may be important. It was for these reasons that the HHEH program was based at the University of Hartford rather than at The Greater Hartford Community College, which has a proportionally larger enrollment of poor and disadvantaged students and of Hartford residents.

The prospects for real and lasting cooperation among the three institutions beyond the program-design phase were almost impossible to predict. Different perceptions of mission, different sensitivities to the problems, and institutional rivalry were the principal forces working against it. But there was a growing awareness among the institutions that they share a common problem concerning the educational needs of Hispanics and that they could work together to deal with the problem

through the project. Furthermore, each institution had some valuable experiences to bring to the joint effort; each had something to gain.

The Project: Design and Goals

The fundamental goal of the Hartford Higher Education Hispanic Program was to improve the recruitment of Hispanics from the area into college. The focus was on out-of-school youth and adults, but attention was to be given also to high school youth and to Hispanic students already in college but who needed help with motivation, basic skills, and language.

Although the project had no stated quotas for Hispanic students and no enrollment targets for each institution or for the group as a whole, it was budgeted at a level thought adequate to handle up to sixty students during the pilot year. In large measure, this level was determined by funds available from the Ford Foundation. Actual enrollment levels would depend on how successful project personnel were in building credibility in the Hispanic community, in developing viable academic and support services, and in strengthening interaction among the three institutions. The job was to develop, in a very real sense, both supply and demand simultaneously.

The project was based in the university's College of Education and Allied Services and placed under the supervision of Dean Irving Starr; he had ultimate responsibility for the project's success or failure. Faculty and administrative personnel, including deans and presidents of the institutions, actively participated in designing the project and in its subsequent development and implementation. The testing, instructional, and academic counseling functions were filled by eighteen university faculty and staff members working part-time on a released time basis. Nonacademic counseling and recruitment in the high schools and to the community—really the heart of the effort insofar as the overcoming of motivational problems was concerned—were provided by three Spanish-speaking persons hired for these purposes. Two worked part-time and one worked full-time. They operated from offices on each of the three campuses. The full-time recruiter-counselor, Rafael Papa, also served as project coordinator. He was based at the Hartford Technical College during 1979 because he had primary responsibility for high school recruitment, the area of particular interest to the college.

The HHEH program had four related components: (1) recruitment;

(2) testing and placement of students; (3) group and one-on-one tutoring in English, mathematics, reading, writing, and spelling; and (4) guidance to facilitate subsequent enrollment in college. Academic and non-academic counseling was provided continuously in all phases of the program and even after students were enrolled in college.

In the first phase of the program, various means were used to recruit and motivate students. Recruitment personnel, who were hired from the Hispanic community, went into neighborhoods to recruit students off the street. Together with other members of the project staff, the recruiters met with representatives of such community agencies as the Spanish-American Center, La Casa de Puerto Rico, San Juan Center, and the Institute for the Hispanic Family. Meetings also were held with Hartford's clergy and with high school counselors. In these meetings, the project staff explained the purpose and content of the HHEH program, the process for admission to it, and the role the community could play in identifying students. Agency representatives recommended prospective students for the program and in many cases contacted prospects at home or at work to tell them about the program. Local radio and newspaper advertisements announced the program, and the staff appeared on television talk shows to describe it and encourage Hispanics to contact the University of Hartford about it. Students either applying to or already enrolled in The Greater Hartford Community College and the Hartford State Technical College were to be referred to the program as well, whenever faculty or administrators thought such students would benefit from the personal attention and the supportive environment that the program offered.

Prospective students received a letter from a member of the project staff inviting them to an evening session at the university to learn more about the program, to meet staff and faculty, to fill out application forms if they wanted to enroll in the program, and then to undergo an hour of diagnostic testing for placement purposes. Subsequently, enrolled students were contacted by telephone and given information about class assignments, meeting times, and classrooms; arrangements were made, where necessary, for their transport to and from campus.

The Michigan English Placement Test was administered to decide whether students should be placed in beginning, intermediate, or advanced classes. Additional testing was carried out in reading and composition when staff deemed it useful, and a specially designed math test was administered to help place students at the proper mathematics level of the program. Each course level had its own fully developed ESL-basic skills component, a math component, and textbooks and related laboratory materials. Some of the instructional materials were developed from scratch, some were purchased, but most were adapted

from other bilingual programs in the university. In general, it was assumed that there is a direct correspondence between proficiency in language skills and proficiency in math. As the program went along, however, it became clear that this was not the case, at least not in the HHEH program. As a result, a single math curriculum that cut across all three levels of the ESL-basic skills programming was substituted for the original ones.

In the instructional program itself, the emphasis was on developing English proficiency. For that reason, traditional methods of ESL were used—all instruction was in English, heavy emphasis was placed on repetition, and little emphasis was given to developing conceptual skills. Beginner and intermediate courses emphasized oral skills and highly structured approaches to reading and writing. The beginner class was designed for students with little or no knowledge of English. The intermediate class began with work on the past tense and moved students through more advanced English constructions. Advanced courses focused on composition, study skills, and intonation drills, using adult-level reading material as well as texts. One staff member commented recently that the orientation in basic skills was essential because both test results and experience showed that students in the beginning and intermediate courses often entered the program unable to perform college-level work, apart from their language problems.

The first full year of instruction included an intensive six-week session in the summer of 1979, in which students met from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. daily on the university campus. The second and third sessions were held during the fall of 1979 and the spring of 1980 terms. These were conducted at a more relaxed pace, in the evening, three times a week for a total of six to seven-and-a-half hours. Every student in the program had an ESL class, a language lab, a mathematics class, a reading and writing class, and an independent study period. During the study periods, instructional staff helped the students with any special problems they might be having in their work.

In the final phase of the program, as students completed work at the intermediate and advanced levels, project staff counseled them on college programs available in their area of interest. Although emphasis was placed on the offerings of the three institutions cooperating in the HHEH program, students were also informed about other institutions in the area and state and encouraged to enroll elsewhere if that best served their need and interest. On the basis of student choice, project recruiters then worked with admissions and financial aid officials in the institutions to arrange enrollment in college. The recruiters often accompanied the students to the admissions office of the college of their choice, helped them fill out forms and apply for financial aid, and otherwise assisted

them through the process of enrollment. In general, students at the beginner and the intermediate levels of the HHEH program were encouraged to move sequentially through the various course levels before considering college enrollment. As will be seen shortly, the presumption was not applicable to some students in the intermediate range.

Enrollments: Achievements and Problems

For the three 1979 to 1980 sessions of the program, there was a cumulative enrollment of 124. Of these, thirty-eight students were enrolled in the 1979 summer session, sixty in the 1979 fall term, and twenty-six in the 1980 spring term. Forty-three students were placed initially in beginning courses, thirty in intermediate, and fifty-one in advanced. Five of the students enrolled in the fall of 1979 had been enrolled in the summer at a lower proficiency level, and they are counted twice in the cumulative enrollment figures given above. All twenty-six students enrolled in the 1980 spring term were continuing on from the basic and intermediate levels in which they had been enrolled earlier.

It should be noted that although the program began with fairly sharp delineations between the three course levels, by the fall and spring sessions it had become clear that the line between work at the intermediate and the advanced levels was drawn too sharply for many intermediate students. As a result, there emerged an intermediate-advanced level of instruction in which many students, though counted in the enrollment figure at the intermediate level, were actually working at the upper level of that range. By the time the year ended, they had moved well into advanced-level work. In any case, the number of individuals actually enrolled in the program during the year was ninety-three, 50 per cent more than was provided for in the project budget.

University data on the demographic makeup of HHEH students were not collected in sufficient detail to get a precise fix on how many of what kind of students were enrolled. But the data do show that the students were a mixture of unemployed youth, high school graduates, workers wishing to advance in their jobs, women at home, and recent immigrant professionals seeking to enter their specialties. Some 60 per cent were Puerto Rican. The rest were mainly from Venezuela, Colombia, and Peru; a few came from El Salvador, Cuba, Spain, Santo Domingo, and Mexico. Women and men were enrolled in roughly equal number. A

wide range of ages was represented; most were twenty to thirty-five years old.

By the end of the 1980 spring session, eighty-four students had completed study programs at the levels in which they were enrolled during the year. Nine students withdrew from the program before completing work at any level. Of the eighty-four who stayed in the program, fifty-two (or 62 per cent) went on to college. As of September 1980, four were enrolled at the University of Hartford, eighteen at Hartford State Technical College, and twenty at The Greater Hartford Community College. The remaining ten went to other public institutions in the area. Some of the students in the beginner and intermediate levels at the end of the first year were expected to continue in the program in the summer or fall of 1980, provided funds for continuation were obtained.

On the basis of these data, it is clear that the project made good progress toward its goal of getting more area Hispanics into higher education. Collectively, Hispanic enrollment in the three institutions increased in one year by about 25 per cent. Given the scale of need in Hartford's Hispanic population and the low institutional enrollment of Hispanics to begin with, this beginning only scratched the surface of an immense local problem – but it is an important beginning nonetheless.

Because discussions about the program for purposes of preparing this paper occurred during the summer of 1980, only nine former HHEH students were available for interview. But conversations with them and with project staff suggest that the great majority of students were genuinely enthusiastic about the program and relieved and grateful that, finally, someone was paying attention to their needs. One student, then enrolled at Hartford State Technical College, said, with a ring of confidence in her voice, "I'm going to the University of Connecticut for computer engineering after I finish here. The [HHEH] program was helpful because it improved my English." A Peruvian, she had gone directly from high school into a training program for public employment, but her poor English had impaired the use of her well-developed skills in mathematics. Another student, a middle-aged mother of three who had been frustrated in earlier attempts to study at Hartford State Technical College and at The Greater Hartford Community College, said of the program: "The teachers know how hard it is; they know what the problems are. Their approach made it easy, not frightening." For her, and for the others interviewed, the program helped to alleviate fear and anxiety. Although such achievements cannot be measured quantitatively, they are nonetheless real.

Further, the Ford Foundation's grant files contain two dozen or so letters handwritten by students in the spring of 1980 in support of the

program. Although the letters were obviously written at the urging of staff members who were eager to demonstrate the worth of the program, there is no mistaking the pride of accomplishment students felt when they wrote. To be sure, some of the letters contain errors in spelling, grammar, and sentence construction, but most are written in simple, accurate English.

These testimonials are encouraging, but what of the students who either withdrew from the program or did not go on to college? Actually, the record of withdrawals from the project should probably be considered good for an undertaking of this sort—the dropout rate was slightly less than 10 per cent. The main reasons given by the students for leaving the program were problems with transportation or scheduling, and personal or home difficulties of one kind or another. According to the project staff, the use of night classes and longer study periods occasioned by less frequent meetings in the fall and spring sessions accounts for most of the dropping out. The staff also noted that there was less opportunity for on-campus interaction between staff members and students in the fall and spring terms, and that may have been a contributing factor as well.

In terms of their relative numbers, however, a more serious area of slippage appears to have been with the thirty-two students who completed the first-year program but did not go on to enroll in college in the fall of 1980. On the other hand, the problem may not be so serious as the number alone suggests because not all of the students entered the program with either the intent or even the need to go on to college. Some had been practicing professionals in their country of origin and were in the HHEH program largely to improve their English. Others came to the program as full-time workers whose immediate objective was to improve their situation on the job.

Nevertheless, according to the project staff many of the students were in neither of these two categories. Some left the program after the first year uncertain about whether they wanted to enroll in college at all. Others left after the first year hoping to reenroll in the program later at a more advanced level. Some, no doubt, would be unable to afford college in any case, even in public institutions, where the costs to students are low and financial aid is available. And for some, because Hartford has minimal public transportation service, the simple matter of getting to and from campus could have seemed to be an insurmountable problem.

Unfortunately, university records do not indicate how many students there were in each of the above categories, so it is impossible to assess how much of a problem the noncollege-going rate really is. It should be noted that when demand for the program turned out to be much larger than anticipated, every effort was made to accept as many students as

possible—on a first-come, first-served basis. But this overload stretched the project and its institutional personnel and material resources to the limit; little room was left for follow-up activity, or for detailed record keeping. Had that not been the case, college enrollment results might have been somewhat better. In addition, a few of the students lost through withdrawal might have been recovered.

It should also be remembered that the future of the project was uncertain beyond the pilot phase. Although a maximum effort was made to accommodate student demand for the program, the university was forced to turn many students away, and to put them on "hold" with a promise of priority attention in the 1980 summer and fall sessions, assuming the program would continue. This was hardly a desirable situation for a program that needed to build and sustain good will in the community. Understandably, the university and its institutional partners were frustrated by this situation. Although budget constraints were responsible for some weaknesses in the program, these problems were clearly exacerbated by the brief length of time in which the pilot phase was conducted. In retrospect, it seems obvious that two years would have provided a better time span for the pilot phase.

In any event, on the basis of the project's achievements, the Ford Foundation made a follow-up matching grant in mid-1980 to institutionalize the program and to help assure its continuation. Subsequently, the Aetna Life and Casualty Foundation decided to provide the required matching support because it was impressed by the program's progress and was convinced of its importance to the city. Ford, Aetna, and university funds have now combined to assure the program's continuation for the next three years (1980–1983) at a budget level of no less than $100,000 annually. Moreover, the university plans to seek additional funding in order to accommodate greater numbers of students each year.

Cooperation: Other Achievements and Problems

Apart from increased enrollments, each of the participating institutions reaped other benefits. In some areas there were subtle changes in the attitudes of administrative personnel; in other areas there were concrete changes of institutional policy and practice. Evaluations of the benefits and problems of cooperating obviously differ—depending on which

institutional representatives are speaking—but in our own assessment the overall results were better than seemed likely at the outset.

Certainly, the project recruiters deserve much of the credit for making the program work to the extent that it did. Hispanic or Spanish-speaking themselves, they were quickly accepted by the Hispanic community. Despite some faculty resistance to them, the recruiters also had good relations with the staff at the three institutions. The strong commitment to the program at the highest levels of the three institutions was crucial. Presidents and deans, working in a project steering committee, guided the project's development and helped solve problems as they came up.

The project also depended on the commitment and time of numerous faculty and staff who marshalled resources for the new students. Their efforts were not financed by grant funds. In fact, only modest provision was made in the grant budget for the participation expenses of the two colleges, since the bulk of the funds was needed by the university for the program's operating costs. Nevertheless, representatives of the two colleges reported that a main benefit of the project for them was that their share of the grant funds gave them at least some of the extra recruiting and counseling help that is essential to extending community outreach. Hartford State Technical College benefited greatly in this regard. Joseph Mandell, dean of students, said that state funds pay for only one counselor for the college's entire student body and the counselor is also the financial aid officer.

As noted, the community college had a sizable increase in Hispanic enrollment as a result of the HHEH program. Actually there was an additional increase as well because of other recent college initiatives on behalf of Hispanics in the area. Such progress could not have been made without attitudinal changes in the institution to reflect a greater concern about the problems of Hispanics. On this point, the community college president, Arthur Banks, Jr., said that in his view, "The Hispanic population of Hartford really does want and need to know about quality education available to them." He also observed that the institutions should be taking more initiative in recruiting and providing programs for Hispanics, rather than waiting for community leaders to press the institutions into action, as has often been the case in the past. Hartford State Technical College—which experienced a sizable increase in Hispanic enrollment as a result of the project—also underwent a change of leadership during the pilot year of the project. Partly as a result of his involvement in HHEH effort, the new president is putting a high priority on more effective recruitment of Hispanics from area high schools.

One of the questions raised by the project's college enrollment results is why so few of the students went on to the University of Hartford. Again, there are no solid data available to explain this result, but it

probably could have been predicted for two reasons. One is that many of the students served by an HHEH-type program tend to have immediate job needs and they therefore gravitate toward institutions that have programs that will improve their employment prospects. The community college and the state technical college, along with other state public institutions, are more likely to have developed programs with these vocational needs in mind. A second is that the cost of attending the university would be prohibitive for many Hispanics with low incomes. The university's annual tuition is $4,050 as contrasted to $177 and $305 at the community college and the technical college, respectively. According to Stephen Trachtenberg, president of the university, the high tuition rate is "dramatically discounted in numerous cases and significantly discounted in many more as a result of a scholarship and loan program which provides aid to students in the millions of dollars." But for Hispanics at the lowest end of the income scale in the Hartford area, there remains a large gap between available aid and financial need—a problem that is not peculiar to the university or the City of Hartford. Finally, it should be remembered that the university is less centrally located than are the other two institutions; even though Hartford is relatively small, it would be hard for many inner-city residents to reach the campus on a regular basis.

As the HHEH program continues over the next three years, officials of the university expect the public institutions to remain the principal beneficiaries of increased Hispanic enrollment. But its commitment to continuing the HHEH program—requiring the use of its own funds—reflects a concern for the Hispanic community that moves beyond the narrow self-interest as well as a recognition that its own past service to Hispanics as been insufficient. The university is an integral part of the city milieu. In the long run, it is in the institution's best interest to help Hispanics in the area to get into college regardless of where they enroll—and the university staff involved in this program increasingly recognize that fact.

It should also be noted that the program now has an established visibility in the community, and community pressures for its continuation are considerable. Demand for the program has remained fairly constant despite the problems of continuity caused by the one-year span of the pilot phase. In the summer 1980 session, forty-five students were enrolled. Twenty-seven completed the program; at this writing accurate data are not available on how many have enrolled in college or plan to. For the session that began in September 1980, eighty-three enrolled, and the university reported at that time a waiting list of fifty applicants for its next scheduled session in the spring of 1981. Among the second-year enrollees to date nine are reenrolled from last year.

There are other signs of attitudinal change in the three institutions as well, though how much of it is due to the project and how much might have happened anyway is hard to judge. Toward the end of the pilot phase, the university hired Dr. Sarah Melendez as its first tenurial Hispanic faculty member. One of her principal responsibilities is to serve as HHEH program director. Rafael Papa, the recruiter-counselor from the first year, has been rehired full-time by the university to continue serving in these roles and to serve as project coordinator and principal community liaison administrator. Continuing to work closely with the technical college on high-school recruitment matters, he will maintain offices at both the university and the college.

Further, there have been some encouraging developments in the availability of financial aid. During the past year, the university has managed to expand its student aid by some 20 per cent specifically to reach more low-income people. The university and the community college are at work now on ways to facilitate enrollment in the university's upper division programs for Hispanic students who complete their lower division work at the community college. To this end, the two institutions recently established a joint scholarship program that will cover a student's tuition costs for four years. The program will begin with two scholarship students at each institution and will add one new student each year. Although the program is not limited to Hispanics, they are expected to benefit from it. The university and the technical college are now discussing a similar joint scholarship program. It would encourage Hispanics and other needy high school students to enroll in the college for the first two years of undergraduate study and then transfer to the university for the final two years.

Promising as these developments are, however, conversations with various people in the three institutions suggest that working together in the HHEH program did not come easily. There seems to have been a lack of understanding in each institution about the academic programs, services, operating styles, and even the intentions of the other two. Partly because of this misunderstanding, and partly because of institutional inertia, there was no discernible movement toward pooling of resources, either to strengthen the HHEH program or to improve the basic skills and bilingual education of Hispanic students once enrolled in college. A pooling of resources was neither an expectation of the pilot project nor a condition of the grant, but the point seems worth noting all the same.

The recent Ford-Aetna continuation grants were based in part on the expectation that Hartford State Technical College and The Greater Hartford Community College would continue their links to the project informally. But if one looks at the demography of Hartford today, which reveals a trend toward an even larger Hispanic population as a

percentage of the total, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that there will have to be more, and more formal, cooperation among the institutions. Such cooperation should lead eventually to a greater willingness to pool resources where appropriate and possible in order to bring about a higher level of service to Hispanics. In addition, although the three institutions already have some links to the schools, to other institutions of higher education in the area, and to local business and industry, these links should be extended and strengthened. To be sure, the differences among these various groups make certain kinds of cooperation extremely difficult, but the differences should not be allowed to stand in the way of opportunities that do exist for cooperation and resource sharing, particularly where working together would produce economies of scale and improved performance.

Even as the institutions struggle to make better use of the resources they already have, new funding formulas are needed to bring about more state support for educational programs that will better serve Hispanics and other poor and disadvantaged people. These new formulas are needed especially for the state technical college, which is a publicly funded institution, and for the community college, which is both publicly funded and mandated to serve the local community. At the very least, future interaction among the three institutions responsible for the HHEH program will be more productive if ways can be found to increase their understanding of what their neighboring institutions are all about.

Costs: A Brief Accounting

The budget for the HHEH program totaled $104,000 for the first year of the grant. About $45,000 was for recruitment, guidance, and academic and general counseling. Another $45,000 was for university instructional personnel as well as for materials in ESL, reading, writing, mathematics, and the development of study skills. The remainder covered costs for support staff, communications, and student transportation.

Calculations of per-student cost indicate that the program was not inexpensive. If computed in the most conservative way, the grant amount, when divided by the fifty-two first-year HHEH students enrolled in area colleges as of September 1980, gives a per-student cost figure of $2,000. There is no way to estimate the in-kind contributions from the institutions during the year, but if they were assumed to total another $50,000, their per-student cost would be $3,000. However, if one

were to apply these same budget figures to the eighty-four HHEH students who "graduated" from the HHEH program during the year, the per-student cost would be considerably less, $1,200–$1,800.

These figures are rough at best, of course, and even if they could be greatly refined, they would tell little about the need for the program. It is common knowledge that preentry and postentry programs and services for the disadvanteged learner are seldom both cheap and effective.

At the same time, there is a need for realism about how much institutions, whether working individually or together, can afford. To be fully responsive to existing needs in Hartford alone, for example, the HHEH program should be many times larger than it is and probably be continued for many years. The principals involved in it recognize that. Private grant funds, which are useful in starting up and demonstrating the worth of a program, are seldom available for long-term continuation or expansion. Thus, for programs like the HHEH to be developed and sustained on a level at all commensurate with the need for them, whether in Hartford or elsewhere, a substantial infusion—or at least a different use—of state and possibly of federal money will be needed.

Neither the state of the national economy nor the growing mood of conservatism around the country gives any reason to believe that much new money will soon become available. So, if higher education institutions are to be more responsive to the educational needs of Hispanics—and, indeed, to those of the poor and disadvantaged in general—nothing less than a major reordering of educational priorities and budget allocations is required not only by educational providers but also by state and federal education agencies. In turn, new review and planning approaches are needed in setting educational purposes and in judging educational performances. For the same reasons more cooperation is needed among educational institutions and between them and educational policy makers.

Conclusion: Some Cautionary Words

There is much in the experience of the Hartford Higher Education Hispanic Program that may be useful to other institutions striving to improve their outreach and service to Hispanics. But it cannot be stressed enough that certain prerequisites are necessary if a program of this kind is to work. For example:

A college or university must have an existing ESL program, including both courses and professional personnel—or it must be able to make a financial and program commitment to develop such a program.

There must exist within an institution, or a collection of institutions, a comprehensive capability for imparting basic skills and providing counseling and guidance.

The use of Hispanics, or Spanish-speaking persons who know the Hispanic community, is vital in the central roles of recruitment and nonacademic counseling and guidance. They provide role models and are in the best position to develop institutional ties to the Hispanic community, with which cooperation is essential.

The institution must have, preferably on site, a well-equipped language laboratory with easy access to tapes, equipment, and other materials.

The institution must also be able to provide a variety of other technical and support services in a visible place where students know they can come on a continuing basis for advice and reinforcement.

These points underscore how important it is for higher education institutions, including those in Hartford, to recognize that the great majority of Hispanic students who enroll in college—even though they come from something like the HHEH program—need to remain in ESL, basic skills, and counseling programs for indefinite periods of time if they are to succeed in their regular academic work. Programs such as the HHEH project are vital if the Hispanic college-going rate is to be improved, but they are only a part of the solution. The rest is in what the institutions do to assure that the new students are given every chance to succeed once they are in college. In the case of Hartford, the HHEH program has been a success, but the final verdict on institutional commitment and performance will be rendered a few years from now when the college graduation results for the new Hispanic students are known.

APPENDIX A

Private Postsecondary Institutions in Boston

	1978 Enrollment
Bay State Junior College of Business	743
Berklee College of Music	2534
Boston Conservatory of Music	445
Boston University	24414
Chamberlayne Junior College	736
Emerson College	1570
Emmanuel College	1059
Fisher Junior College	2081
Forsyth School of Dental Hygienists	193
Franklin Institute of Boston	658
Katherine Gibbs School	510
Laboure Junior College	446
Newbury Junior College	2333
New England College of Optometry	350
New England Conservatory of Music	761
New England Institute of Applied Arts & Sciences	172
New England School of Law	913
Northeastern University	34043
School of the Museum of Fine Arts–Boston	931
Simmons College	2598
Suffolk University	6373
Wentworth Institute of Technology	2177
Wheelock College	946
TOTAL	86,986

The Boston Six

The following brief descriptions include geographic locations, transportation access, demographic characteristics of the student body, and program information.

TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

Bunker Hill Community College: Founded in 1973. Located in the Charlestown section of Boston. Adjacent to the subway system and convenient to several major arterial roads. Day enrollment is about 2,500; continuing education enrollment is about 3,000. Over 80 per cent of the day students live within five miles of the college. Over 40 per cent come from families with annual incomes of less than $10,000. The average age for a day student is 27 and for a continuing-education student, 33.

Bunker Hill offers a full complement of liberal arts and career programs, including concentrations in nursing (R.N.), computer programming, culinary arts, and transportation management.

Massachusetts Bay Community College: Founded in 1961. Moved twice before settling in suburban Wellesley. Convenient to bus routes and major highways. Day enrollment is about 2,000 students, of whom over 90 per cent live within fifteen miles of the college. About half come from families with incomes under $12,000 a year.

Massachusetts Bay offers a full complement of liberal arts and career programs, including concentrations in accounting, x-ray technology, and early childhood education.

Roxbury Community College: Founded in 1973. Located in the Roxbury section of Boston, an area with an unemployment rate of 50 per cent and an average resident age of 27. The college is still searching for a permanent facility. It has about 750 students in its day and evening

programs; most come from families with incomes below $7,500 a year. Present enrollment is 78 per cent black and 14 per cent Spanish speaking.

Roxbury has both liberal arts and career programs, including one-year courses in computer testing, secretarial work, and business management.

FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES

Boston State College: Founded as the Boston Normal School in 1851. Located in the Fenway section of Boston. Adjacent to the subway system. Half of its 5,600 full-time and 4,500 part-time students come from Boston itself. Of the full-time students, 85 per cent work part-time, half are 22 or older, and 15 per cent are from minority groups.

Boston State offers academic programs in the liberal arts, education, and business, as well as in nursing, public service, and computer science.

Massachusetts College of Art: Founded in 1873, the nation's first institution of its kind. Located in the Fenway section. Enrollment is about 1,100 in the day division and 1,000 in continuing education. One-third of the students come from families with annual incomes below $7,000, and another one-third come from families with incomes between $7,000 and $16,000 a year. Minority groups constitute 9 per cent of the enrollment.

Massachusetts College of Art offers programs in art education and history, illustration, painting, sculpture, and other art fields.

STATE UNIVERSITY

University of Massachusetts at Boston (UMass/Boston) Founded in 1965. Principal campus overlooks Boston harbor in the Dorchester section of the city. Accessible to the subway system and a major highway. A downtown campus is located in the Park Square area. Of its approximately 7,300 students, 74 per cent live within 10 miles of the university; 28 per cent come from families with annual incomes below $10,000; and 12 per cent are members of a minority group.

UMass/Boston has three colleges: Arts and Sciences, Management and Professional Studies, and Public and Community Service.

Ford Foundation Grants

1. The Boston Six — **$100,000 in 1978; 48,000 in 1980**

Contact:
Neil Didriksen, Executive Director, The Boston Six, 250 Stuart Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02116

2. Miles College — **$115,103 in 1978; 50,000 in 1980**

Contact:
Alandus Johnson, Vice President, Miles College, Birmingham, Alabama 35208

3. University of Hartford — **$104,000 in 1978; 51,200 in 1980**

Contact:
Sarah Melendez, Project Director, College of Education and Allied Services, University of Hartford, 200 Bloomfield Avenue, West Hartford, Connecticut 06117

4. The San Francisco Consortium — **$99,800 in 1978; 2,500 in 1980**

Contact:
John M. Selig, Executive Director, The San Francisco Consortium, 111 New Montgomery Street, Suite 600, San Francisco, California 94105

The San Francisco Consortium includes the city's eight accredited higher educational institutions. The consortium was created about twelve years ago to facilitate the sharing of ideas and resources among its members and help them address urban problems

more effectively. The consortium institutions have developed a variety of programs over the years to increase the number of disadvantaged students enrolled on their campuses and to prepare such students to compete in the job market. As in other cities, there is still a wide gap between those served and not served in the Bay Area.

The Foundation's 1978 grant of $99,800 supported a project that aimed to provide analysis and recommendations for consideration and possible implementation by the member institutions. The effort had three interrelated parts: (1) an evaluation of past and present efforts of member institutions to serve local disadvantaged racial and ethnic minorities; (2) an up-to-date assessment of the educational needs of disadvantaged people in the city, with emphasis on youth but attention also to the adult population; and (3) an assessment of the city's business climate, labor market, and efforts by businesses to reach out to the target groups. The public school system and agencies of local government participated in the project.

A Foundation grant supplement in 1980 provided for publication and dissemination of the final report of the project. The report is entitled *A Cooperative Self-Assessment of Programs for the Disadvantaged in the San Francisco Consortium's Universities and Colleges;* its author is Frank Baratta, who directed the project.

5. Jersey City State College **$115,000 in 1978**
50,414 in 1980

Contact:
Larry Carter, Assistant Dean, School of Arts and Sciences, Jersey City State College, 2039 Kennedy Boulevard, Jersey City, New Jersey 07305

Hudson County in New Jersey has the largest foreign-born population of any county in the nation; new immigrants arrive almost daily. Nearly 80 per cent of the 10,000 persons who enroll annually in Jersey City State College have problems with basic skills and language. The college offers a variety of programs in basic skills and English as a second language, but their effectiveness is reduced because the majority of faculty are not motivated to understand or trained to work with students in need of such nurturing. That problem exists in urban-oriented colleges and universities nationwide. The Foundation's 1978 grant was designed to help the college

train its faculty to provide the nurturing needed. The college was encouraged to involve Hudson County Community College and Saint Peter's College in a joint faculty development effort so that all could gain from working together on problems that are, in some degree, common to all.

Faculty and instructional designers who were adept in teaching basic skills worked with cadres of core faculty from different disciplines in the three institutions. Through workshops, informal faculty meetings, and specially developed instructional materials, the project aimed to sensitize faculty to the needs of the kinds of students their institutions serve, expose the faculty to various methods of teaching basic skills, and assist them in revising their general studies curriculum to include basic skills. Underlying this effort was the fundamental proposition that all basic skills programs must be integrated with introductory and general academic courses rather than conducted as an isolated enterprise on the periphery of the college's main work.

Although efforts at faculty development are always slow to produce results, good progress toward the objectives of the grant was made by the college during the first two years. Because the college is funded totally by the state, and has little flexibility in its current budget due to the state's economic austerity the Foundation's supplemental grant in 1980 was designed to help the college institutionalize the project by establishing the Center for Innovative Teaching for faculty development.

As a result of its participation in the project, Saint Peter's College has created a Faculty Service Center on its own campus with non-Ford funding. Hudson County Community College, had no faculty of its own in 1978, but is now in the process of forming one. It has also hired basic skills teachers to work with the new core faculty.

6. University of the District of Columbia **$112,490 in 1978**

Contact:
Ewaugh Fields, Dean, University College,
University of the District of Columbia, 4200
Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008

The University of the District of Columbia is the result of a merger of three Washington public institutions in 1976 and is now in a period of academic and organizational consolidation. Like other institu-

tions that serve the urban poor and disadvantaged, the university has a very high student attrition rate.

The Foundation's grant provides partial support for the development of a comprehensive program to diagnose student learning problems and achievement levels and to guide the university's remediation, guidance, and counseling programs. In part, the project is an attempt to coordinate programs that existed in the university's predecessor institutions. But it moves beyond existing resources and methodology to examine alternate testing approaches, learner problems for which current procedures are ill suited, and cost factors associated with alternate testing and assessment. A system of analytical transcripts is under development. When completed, it will provide academic and personal profiles on entering students for use by faculty and counselors. Staff development sessions and other activities are carried out to familiarize faculty with the uses of testing data and approaches to the development of curricula and the improvement of teaching techniques. Pilot testing is conducted on students in the college and in the local high schools, and efforts are under way to develop better relations with the public schools. The overall objective is to reduce student attrition.

7. American Association of State Colleges and Universities **$168,156 in 1978**

Contact:
Kurt Smith, Project Director, Urban College and University Network, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036

This grant provided support for a national project that had three broad objectives: (1) to increase communication among urban-oriented colleges and universities nationwide; (2) to help the institutions and policy makers think about and better understand the nature of urban colleges and universities and their role in the life and future of the cities; and (3) to report, through a series of published profiles, on selected programs and approaches in institutions that effectively serve the special educational needs of the urban poor and disadvantaged.

Although based at the American Association of State Colleges and Universities—designated by the American Council on Education to be the lead

agency for urban higher education work—the project has an advisory board that assures the participation of colleges and universities beyond the association.

8. The College Board **$25,000 in 1978**

Contact:
Lawrence Gladieux, Executive Director,
Washington Office of the College Board,
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.,
Washington, D.C. 20036

This grant supported a study of obstacles to the full use of federal student aid programs by the urban poor. Findings and recommendations were presented in a Foundation publication entitled *Student Aid and the Urban Poor* (1981).